

An evaluation of the elementary
evaluative criteria.

Degnan, John P.
Hewitt, William S.
Potenza, Joseph H.
Rosenberg, Manuel M.
Stevenson, John R.

Thesis
1955



BOSTON UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

LIBRARY

Thesis
Degnan, J.P.
1955 et al.

The Gift of..... John P. Degnan et al.



Thesis
Degan, J. P., et al
1955

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Thesis

AN EVALUATION OF THE ELEMENTARY EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

Submitted by

John P. Degan
(B.S. in Ed., Boston University, 1950)

William S. Hewitt
(A.B., Harvard University, 1954)

Joseph H. Potenza
(B.S. in Ed., Holy Cross College, 1943)

Manuel M. Rosenberg
(A.B., Syracuse University, 1951)

John R. Stevenson
(B.S. in Elementary Ed., Allen University, 1951)

In partial fulfillment of requirements for
the degree of Master of Education

1955

School of Education

May 18, 1955

44028

Acknowledgments

Heartful acknowledgment is given to Dr. B. Alice Crossley,
teacher and First Reader: Dr. B. Alice Crossley Associate Professor of Education
project; to Dr. James F. Baker for his helpful suggestions and advice;
Second Reader: Dr. James F. Baker Associate Professor of Education
and to the librarians in the library for their
patient and timely help during the year.

First Reader: Dr. B. Alice Crossley
Associate Professor of Education

Second Reader: Dr. James F. Baker
Associate Professor of Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I STATEMENT AND JUSTIFICATION OF THE PROBLEM.	1
II REVIEW OF RESEARCH.	3
III PLAN OF THE STUDY.	15
IV THE ANALYSIS OF DATA.	29
Acknowledgments	
V SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.	37

Grateful acknowledgment is given to Dr. B. Alice Crossley, teacher and adviser, for her wise and helpful guidance throughout this project; to Dr. James F. Baker for his helpful suggestions and advice; and to the librarians in the School of Education library, for their patient and timely help during the year.

A. QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO USES OF CRITERIA.	43
B. QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO CONTENTS OF CRITERIA.	44
C. QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO GENERAL REACTIONS TO CRITERIA.	45
D. LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL.	46
E. QUESTIONNAIRE FORM.	47

Acknowledgments

Grateful acknowledgment is given to Dr. R. Alice Crossley, teacher and adviser, for her wise and helpful guidance throughout this project; to Dr. James F. Baker for his helpful suggestions and advice; and to the librarians in the School of Education library, for their patient and timely help during the year.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I STATEMENT AND JUSTIFICATION OF THE PROBLEM.	1
II REVIEW OF RESEARCH.	3
III PLAN OF THE STUDY	15
IV THE ANALYSIS OF DATA.	19
V SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	37
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	41
APPENDIX.	43
A. QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO USES OF CRITERIA.	43
B. QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO CONTENTS OF CRITERIA.	44
C. QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO GENERAL REACTIONS TO CRITERIA.	45
D. LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL	46
E. QUESTIONNAIRE FORM.	47

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE	CHAPTER
1	I STATEMENT AND JUSTIFICATION OF THE PROBLEM
3	II REVIEW OF RESEARCH
12	III PLAN OF THE STUDY
19	IV THE ANALYSIS OF DATA
27	V SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS
111	BIBLIOGRAPHY
113	APPENDIX
113	A. QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO USES OF CRITERIA
114	B. QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO CONTENTS OF CRITERIA
115	C. QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO GENERAL REACTIONS TO CRITERIA
116	D. LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL
117	E. QUESTIONNAIRE FORM

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. PURPOSES FOR WHICH THE CRITERIA WERE USED	21
II. RATINGS DESIGNATED TO VARIOUS SECTIONS OF THE CRITERIA.	22
III. GENERAL REACTIONS TO CRITERIA	24
IV. POSITION OF INDIVIDUAL FILLING OUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE. .	25
V. USE OF THE CRITERIA WITH LAY PERSONNEL.	25
VI. IMPROVEMENT INDICATED IN COMMUNITIES USING CRITERIA.. .	26
VII. RATINGS DESIGNATED TO VARIOUS SECTIONS OF THE CRITERIA.	27
VIII. GENERAL REACTIONS TO CRITERIA	29
IX. POSITION OF INDIVIDUAL FILLING OUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE. .	30
X. USE OF THE CRITERIA WITH LAY PERSONNEL.	31
XI. IMPROVEMENT INDICATED IN COMMUNITIES USING CRITERIA . .	32

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE	TABLE
21	I. PURPOSES FOR WHICH THE CRITERIA WERE USED
22	II. RATINGS DESIGNATED TO VARIOUS SECTIONS OF THE CRITERIA
24	III. GENERAL REACTIONS TO CRITERIA
25	IV. POSITION OF INDIVIDUAL FILLING OUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE
25	V. USE OF THE CRITERIA WITH LAY PERSONNEL
26	VI. IMPROVEMENT INDICATED IN COMMUNITIES USING CRITERIA
27	VII. RATINGS DESIGNATED TO VARIOUS SECTIONS OF THE CRITERIA
29	VIII. GENERAL REACTIONS TO CRITERIA
30	IX. POSITION OF INDIVIDUAL FILLING OUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE
31	X. USE OF THE CRITERIA WITH LAY PERSONNEL
32	XI. IMPROVEMENT INDICATED IN COMMUNITIES USING CRITERIA

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT AND JUSTIFICATION OF THE PROBLEM

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM. - The problem is to evaluate the Elementary Evaluative Criteria which was copyrighted in 1952 by Dr. Fred F. Baker of Boston University's School of Education. Specifically such evaluation is to determine how the Elementary Evaluative Criteria has aided superintendents, supervisors, administrators, teachers, and lay personnel in evaluating their local elementary school progress in any of its parts.

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT AND JUSTIFICATION

OF THE PROBLEM

Important, in fact, and in the development and growth of the Corporation Study of Secondary-School Standards developed an Evaluative Criteria for the secondary school in 1952. In 1953 a revised set of Evaluative Criteria was authorized for publication.

The Evaluative Criteria have been used very extensively by school systems and have proved of great value in affecting improved progress and results in the secondary school program.

A working group at Boston University in 1953 authorized the task of developing criteria for various areas of the elementary school.

Each member of the group was given a specific area of the elementary school to evaluate and analyze. Each member's progress was to develop a set of criteria to evaluate his particular area. The results

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT AND JUSTIFICATION

OF THE PROBLEM

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT AND JUSTIFICATION OF THE PROBLEM

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.- -The problem is to evaluate the Elementary Evaluative Criteria which was copyrighted in 1953 by Dr. James F. Baker of Boston University's School of Education. Specifically this evaluation is to determine how the Elementary Evaluative Criteria has aided superintendents, supervisors, administrators, teachers, and lay personnel in evaluating their total elementary school program or any of its parts.

JUSTIFICATION OF THE PROBLEM.- -As a result of six years of experiment, analysis, and refinement of materials and procedures, the Cooperative Study of Secondary-School Standards developed an Evaluative Criteria for the secondary school in 1940. In 1950 a revised form of Evaluative Criteria was authorized for publication.

The Evaluative Criteria have been used very extensively by secondary schools and have proved of great value in effecting improved procedures and methods in the secondary school program.

A seminar group at Boston University in 1952 undertook the task of developing criteria for various areas of the elementary school.

Each member of the group was given a specific area in the elementary school to evaluate and analyze. Each member's purpose was to develop a set of criteria to evaluate his particular area. The resulting

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT AND JUSTIFICATION OF THE PROBLEM

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM. -- The problem is to evaluate the El-

mentary Evaluative Criteria which was copyrighted in 1953 by Dr. James F. Baker of Boston University's School of Education. Specifically this evaluation is to determine how the Elementary Evaluative Criteria has aided superintendents, supervisors, administrators, teachers, and lay personnel in evaluating their total elementary school program or any of its parts.

JUSTIFICATION OF THE PROBLEM. -- As a result of six years of

experiment, analysis, and refinement of materials and procedures, the Cooperative Study of Secondary-School Standards developed an Evaluative Criteria for the secondary school in 1950. In 1953 a revised form of Evaluative Criteria was authorized for publication. The Evaluative Criteria have been used very extensively by secondary schools and have proved of great value in effecting improved procedures and methods in the secondary school program. A seminar group at Boston University in 1952 undertook the task of developing criteria for various areas of the elementary school. Each member of the group was given a specific area in the elementary school to evaluate and analyze. Each member's purpose was to develop a set of criteria to evaluate his particular area. The resulting

work of each member, prior to the termination of his study, was sent to prominent specialists in that field or area for evaluation and criticism.

In 1953 Dr. James F. Baker constructed an Elementary Evaluative Criteria comprised of the criteria developed by the seminar group mentioned above. He analyzed, revised, and compiled these separate criteria into one criteria which he copyrighted and published under the name Elementary Evaluative Criteria.

In order for any evaluative instrument to be effective it should be revised from time to time in light of changing concepts. "Any evaluation program should be subject to revision. It must be responsive," says Ostrander^{1/}, "to changes in the curriculum and to conditions outside the school which affect children. It should be flexible so that it can be modified in accordance with advances in the techniques of evaluation." 1954 was chosen as the time to evaluate the Elementary Evaluative Criteria as to its effectiveness as a measuring instrument of the elementary school.

This study has been undertaken to determine if the Elementary Evaluative Criteria has fulfilled its mission of helping school personnel evaluate the school program.

^{1/} R. H. Ostrander, "Evaluation in the Oak Ridge Schools," Educational Leadership, (November, 1950) 8:86-90. p. 88.

work of each member, prior to the termination of his study, was sent to prominent specialists in that field or area for evaluation and criticism.

In 1953 Dr. James F. Baker constructed an Elementary Evaluative Criteria comprised of the criteria developed by the seminar group mentioned above. He analyzed, revised, and compiled these separate criteria into one criteria which he copyrighted and published under the name

Elementary Evaluative Criteria.

In order for any evaluative instrument to be effective it should

be revised from time to time in light of changing concepts. "Any

evaluation program should be subject to revision. It must be responsive,"

Mr. Gattender, "to changes in the curriculum and to conditions outside

the school which affect children. It should be flexible so that it can

be modified in accordance with advances in the techniques of evaluation."

1953 was chosen as the time to evaluate the Elementary Evaluative Criteria

as to its effectiveness as a measuring instrument of the elementary

school.

This study has been undertaken to determine if the Elementary

Evaluative Criteria has fulfilled its mission of helping school personnel

evaluate the school program.

Mr. E. H. Gattender, "Evaluation in the Oak Ridge Schools," Instructional Leadership, (November, 1953) 3:86-90, p. 88.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RESEARCH

RESEARCH PERTAINING TO EVALUATION. - "The nature of recent evaluation techniques is very intimately related to the concept of the role and purpose of evaluation underlying them." ^{1/} ^{2/} Table lists some of the basic characteristics of the current evaluation practices:

1) Modern curriculum is concerned with the growth of the whole child, no matter how inadequately and unclearly this purpose may be perceived and no matter how inadequately the practice may live up to it. 2) Consequently, in evaluation, serious efforts in being made to operate in terms of educational outcomes as is considered to be significant objectives of student growth. 3) Thus, besides the content and basic skills, attention is devoted to the development of interests, desirable social attitudes, critical thinking, social adjustment, and increasingly intelligent tools and techniques of learning and study. . . . 4) Better evaluation practices also attempt to operate desirable changes in behavior processes in place of the mastery of content. 5) It is equally important as to what the evaluation data that each bit of it is interpreted in the light of all other available evidence.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RESEARCH

^{3/} Wrightstone says, "Modern evaluation is characterized by several criteria. First, it attempts to measure a comprehensive range of objectives of the modern school curriculum rather than limited subject matter content only."

^{1/} Hilda Taba, "Current Evaluation Techniques," Childhood Education, (September, 1961) 18:14-20, p.14.

^{2/} Ibid., pp. 14-15.

^{3/} J. W. Wrightstone, "Trends in Evaluation," Situational Leadership, (November, 1960) 5:91-95, p.91.

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RESEARCH

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RESEARCH

RESEARCH PERTAINING TO EVALUATION.- -"The nature of recent evaluation techniques is very intimately related to the concept of the role and purpose of evaluation underlying them."^{1/} Taba^{2/} lists some of the basic characteristics of the current evaluation practices:

1) Modern curriculum is concerned with the growth of the whole child, no matter how inarticulately and unclearly this purpose may be perceived and no matter how incompletely the practice may live up to it. 2) Consequently, in evaluation, serious effort is being made to appraise as wide a range of educational outcomes as is considered to be significant objectives of student growth. 3) Thus, besides the mastery of information and basic skills, attention is devoted to ways of getting adequate and objective evidence of development of interests, desirable social attitudes, critical thinking, social adjustment, and increasingly intelligent tools and techniques of learning and study . . . 4) Newer evaluation practices also attempt to appraise desirable changes in behavior processes in place of the mastery of content. 5) It is equally important to so treat the evaluation data that each bit of it is interpreted in the light of all other available evidence.

^{3/} Wrightstone says, "Modern evaluation is characterized by several criteria. First, it attempts to measure a comprehensive range of objectives of the modern school curriculum rather than limited subject matter achievement only."

^{1/} Hilda Taba, "Current Evaluation Techniques," Childhood Education, (September, 1941) 18:14-20. p.14.

^{2/} Ibid., pp. 14-15.

^{3/} J. W. Wrightstone, "Trends in Evaluation," Educational Leadership, (November, 1950) 8:91-95. p.91.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RESEARCH

RESEARCH PERTAINING TO EVALUATION - "The nature of recent

evaluation techniques is very intimately related to the concept of the
role and purpose of evaluation underlying them." Table lists some of

the basic characteristics of the current evaluation practices:

- 1) Modern curriculum is concerned with the growth of the whole child, no matter how intellectually and materially this growth may be perceived and no matter how incompletely the practice may live up to it. 2) Consequently, in evaluation, serious effort is being made to provide as wide a range of educational outcomes as is considered to be significant objectives of student growth. 3) Thus, besides the mastery of information and basic skills, attention is devoted to ways of getting adequate and objective evidence of development of interests, desirable social attitudes, critical thinking, social adjustment, and increasingly intelligent tools and techniques of learning and study. . . . 4) Modern evaluation practices also attempt to appraise desirable changes in behavior processes in place of the mastery of content. 5) It is especially important to present the evaluation data that each bit of it is interpreted in the light of all other available evidence.

Whippleton says, "Modern evaluation is characterized by several

criteria. First, it attempts to measure a comprehensive range of objectives of the modern school curriculum rather than limited subject matter achievement only."

Wills, "Current Evaluation Techniques," Childhood Education, (October, 1951) 18:11-20, p. 11.

Table, pp. 11-12.

J. E. Whippleton, "Trends in Evaluation," Educational Leadership, (November, 1950) 8:91-92, p. 91.

Hammond and Drummond^{1/} believe that:

In looking for the good elementary school, we shall probably be in search of something that we shall never quite find--at least in a literal or absolute sense. Good is after all only a relative term, and schools--like individuals, will probably have many strong points, and at least a few weak points. No matter how good a school may be today, it has a chance of being better or worse tomorrow. Many factors go into the making of a good school, some of which are beyond the power of school people to provide. Schools, like individual pupils, should be evaluated, always in terms of their purposes and how well they are discharging obligations in terms of what they have to work with.

"In general, the techniques of evaluation and measurement," says Remmers^{2/}, "are based upon the very useful theory and applications of sampling and inferential statistics."

"Although a great deal has been written about evaluation," says Shane^{3/}, "and the evaluative process in the past ten or fifteen years the question of what actually constitutes appraisal in modern education is not yet a matter of common agreement in educational practice."

Shane and Rovner^{4/} conducted a survey in 1950 to determine some of the interpretations of evaluation and they concluded that:

The survey suggested that five meanings have attached themselves to the term: (1) evaluation as a synonym for a testing program, (2) evaluation as a means of gauging competence of

1/ Sarah L. Hammond and Harold D. Drummond, "A Region Evaluates its Elementary Schools," Educational Leadership, (November, 1950) 8:95-100. Quoted from the Tentative edition of Elementary Evaluative Criteria. Vol. I, p.21.

2/ H. H. Remmers, "Evaluation in Curriculum Development," School and Society, (July, 1949) 70:33-37. p.35.

3/ Harold G. Shane, "A 1950 Census of Evaluation Practices," Educational Leadership, (November, 1950) 8:73-77. p.73.

4/ Ibid., p.73.

Lawson and Gurnea believe that:

In looking for the good elementary school, we shall probably be in search of something that we shall never quite find--at least in a literal or absolute sense. Good is after all only a relative term, and schools--like individuals, will probably have many strong points, and at least a few weak points. No matter how good a school may be today, it has a chance of being better or worse tomorrow. Many factors go into the making of a good school, some of which are beyond the power of school people to provide. Schools, like individual pupils, should be evaluated, always in terms of their purposes and how well they are discharging obligations in terms of what they have to work with.

"In general, the techniques of evaluation and measurement," says

Gurnea, "are based upon the very same theory and applications of

weighting and inferential statistics."

"Although a great deal has been written about evaluation," says

Gurnea, "and the evaluative process in the past ten or fifteen years

the question of what actually constitutes evaluation in modern education

is not yet a matter of common agreement in educational practice."

Gurnea and Lawson conducted a survey in 1950 to determine some

of the interrelationships of evaluation and they concluded that:

The survey suggested that five meanings have attached themselves to the term: (1) evaluation as a synonym for a testing program, (2) evaluation as a means of judging competence of

Lawson, L. and Gurnea, R. D. "A Nation Evaluates Its Elementary Schools," Educational Leadership, (November, 1950) 8:92-100. Quoted from the tentative edition of Elementary Evaluation Criteria, Vol. I, p. 21.

Gurnea, R. D. "Evaluation in Curriculum Development," School and Society, (July, 1950) 70:33-37, p. 35.

Gurnea, R. D. "A 1950 Census of Evaluation Practices," Educational Leadership, (November, 1950) 8:73-77, p. 73.

Vol. I, p. 73.

individual teachers, (3) evaluation as a procedure followed in judging effectiveness of the over-all program of a school, (4) evaluation as an expression of values in the form of criteria to be used subsequently in studying specific problems, practices or conditions in the classroom, administration or curriculum, and (5) evaluation as a process by means of which changes in behavior of children are studied and guided toward goals sought by a school.

A Florida State University elementary workshop group, during the summer of 1949, explored the field of evaluation, to provide for self-appraisal, and to suggest means for evaluating phases of the program usually considered intangible. Hammond and Drummond^{1/} tell us that this group developed several ideas:

As the workshop progressed, participants agreed that evaluation involves at least three steps: (1) stating values or purposes which the school deems important, (2) securing evidences regarding the extent to which the values or purposes are realized in practice, and (3) planning ways in which the values or purposes might be better achieved or more fully realized and related. The development of an awareness of values, therefore, was seen to be the heart of learning.

A review of the data listed previously seems to indicate that one may crystallize the principles of evaluation in the following manner. Before an evaluation is attempted there should be agreed upon values and objectives to guide the evaluator. Single words or works should be eliminated and in their places words in "diagnostically meaningful terms" should be substituted. It should be kept in mind that evaluation is a continuous process that is a direct part of the teaching-learning situation and should cover a long period of time rather than a short period.^{2/}

^{1/} Sarah L. Hammond and Harold D. Drummond, op. cit., pp. 96-97.

^{2/} H. J. McNally, "Evaluation--Of What? For What?", Educational Administration and Supervision, (January, 1949) 35:36-48

individual teachers, (3) evaluation as a procedure followed in judging effectiveness of the overall program of a school, (4) evaluation as an expression of values in the form of criteria to be used subsequently in studying specific problems, practices or conditions in the classroom, administration or curriculum, and (5) evaluation as a process by means of which changes in behavior of children are studied and guided toward goals sought by a school.

A Florida State University elementary workshop group, during the

summer of 1949, explored the field of evaluation, to provide for self-

appraisal, and to suggest means for evaluating phases of the program

usually considered intangible. Hammond and Brummond tell us that this

group developed several ideas:

As the workshop progressed, participants agreed that evaluation involves at least three steps: (1) stating values or purposes which the school deems important, (2) securing evidence regarding the extent to which the values or purposes are realized in practice, and (3) planning ways in which the values or purposes might be better achieved or more fully realized and related. The development of an awareness of values, therefore, was seen to be the heart of learning.

A review of the data listed previously seems to indicate that

one may crystallize the principles of evaluation in the following

manner. Before an evaluation is attempted there should be agreed upon

values and objectives to guide the evaluator. Single words or words

should be eliminated and in their place words in "diagnostically mean-

ingful terms" should be substituted. It should be kept in mind that

evaluation is a continuous process that is a direct part of the teaching-

learning situation and should cover a long period of time rather than

a short period.

1/ Sarah L. Hammond and Harold B. Brummond, op. cit., pp. 96-97.

2/ H. J. McCall, "Evaluation--Of What? For What?", Educational Administration and Supervision, (January, 1949) 32:36-48

In evaluating elementary schools, Henry^{1/} cites the findings of a Texas state committee as follows:

The criteria selected are classified under seven major headings: (1) 'The Children', (2) 'The Teachers', (3) 'The Program of School Life', (4) 'Instructional Equipment and Supplies', (5) 'Administration'. Each major heading is subdivided into topics representing significant phases of the area designated.

Wrightstone^{2/} in his article on "Trends in Evaluation" points out that:

Modern evaluative criteria is characterized by several criteria.

1) It attempts to measure a comprehensive range of objectives of the modern school curriculum rather than limited subject-matter achievement only.

2) Modern evaluation uses a variety of techniques of appraisal such as--achievement, attitude, personality and character tests. Also rating scales of products, interviews, controlled-observation techniques, sociometric techniques and anecdotal records.

3) Evaluation includes integrating and interpreting the various indexes of behavior changes so as to construct an inclusive portrait of an individual or an educational situation.

"Evaluation is a constant process of the consideration of the degree," says Ostrander^{3/}, "to which the results and by-products of the education program reach the stated and implied objectives of the program."

Results are often indecisive and it has been concluded that evaluation is not completely a precise, scientific process--defined by tables, statistics, infallible instruments, and measureables.

^{1/} N. B. Henry, "Evaluating Elementary Schools," The Elementary School Journal, (February, 1946) 46:307-308. p.308.

^{2/} J. W. Wrightstone, op. cit., p.91.

^{3/} R. H. Ostrander, op. cit., p.87.

6

In evaluating elementary schools, Henry offers the findings of

a Texas state committee as follows:

The criteria selected are classified under seven major headings: (1) 'The Children', (2) 'The Teachers', (3) 'The Program of School Life', (4) 'Instructional Equipment and Supplies', (5) 'Administration'. Each major heading is subdivided into topics representing significant phases of the area designated.

Wrightstone in his article on "Trends in Evaluation" points out

that:

Modern evaluative criteria is characterized by several

criteria.

1) It attempts to measure a comprehensive range of objectives of the school system rather than limited subject-matter achievement only.

2) Modern evaluation uses a variety of techniques of appraisal, such as--achievement, attitude, personality and character tests. Also using samples of products, interviews, controlled-observation techniques, sociometric techniques and anecdotal records.

3) Evaluation includes interpreting and interpreting the various indexes of behavior changes so as to construct an inclusive portrait of an individual or an educational situation.

"Evaluation is a constant process of the consideration of the

degree," says Wrightstone, "to which the results and by-products of the

educational program reach the stated and implied objectives of the

program."

Results are often inconclusive and it has been concluded that

evaluation is not completely a precise, scientific process--defined by

tables, statistics, infallible instruments, and measurements.

W. E. Henry, "Evaluating Elementary Schools," The Elementary School Journal, (February, 1946) 46:307-308. p.308.

W. E. Wrightstone, op. cit., p. 91.

W. E. Wrightstone, op. cit., p. 91.

^{1/}
 Vincent points out that the direct evaluation of the results we are seeking in education is discouraging because they take so long to mature. Direct measurement would be difficult if not impossible to obtain so we must seek techniques to "measure them indirectly."

In the case of the unavailability of the direct interview method, a system whereby this can be done by practical means must be devised. The most popular and most practical method, from an economical and time saving point of view, must be used.

^{2/}
RESEARCH PERTAINING TO THE INQUIRY FORM.- -Nichols defines a questionnaire as:

A questionnaire is the outward expression of an inner urge to find out how to do a better piece of work: how to teach something better; how to find new instruction material; how to be sure current procedures are sound; how to remedy faults of technique. It may, and often does, result from a yearning for corroborating evidence as to the soundness of the things we believe. It is a neat device for use in gathering factual data.

With only a cursory glance at this statement, the reader probably dismisses this statement from his mind, thinking it too obvious to ponder over. A little thought would convince him that this is not just another empty, turgid, abstruse conjecture on the part of Nichols, but couched within the language is the framework of the true definition of

^{1/} William S. Vincent, "Taking Inventory--Finding Ways to Evaluate Results," School Executive, (January, 1950) 69:73-78.

^{2/} Frederick G. Nichols, "Criticism, Comment and Challenge," Journal of Business Education, (June, 1933) 8:8. p.8.

EFFICIENT BRAND

HAS CONTENT

It is a fact that the most efficient brand of paper is the one that has the most content. This is because the more content a brand has, the more it can be used for a variety of purposes. This is why the most efficient brand of paper is the one that has the most content.

The most efficient brand of paper is the one that has the most content. This is because the more content a brand has, the more it can be used for a variety of purposes. This is why the most efficient brand of paper is the one that has the most content.

The most efficient brand of paper is the one that has the most content. This is because the more content a brand has, the more it can be used for a variety of purposes. This is why the most efficient brand of paper is the one that has the most content.

The most efficient brand of paper is the one that has the most content. This is because the more content a brand has, the more it can be used for a variety of purposes. This is why the most efficient brand of paper is the one that has the most content.

The most efficient brand of paper is the one that has the most content. This is because the more content a brand has, the more it can be used for a variety of purposes. This is why the most efficient brand of paper is the one that has the most content.

a questionnaire. Huffman^{1/} elaborates on the concept of the questionnaire when he states:

Since the questionnaire is not only a means for determining the extent of agreement in observations, but it is also a trail-blazer in fundamental educational investigation, it is an instrument well deserving of meticulous construction. Suggested for improving the questionnaire so that it will attain its optimum usefulness as a tool of research are: finding its weaknesses and strengths, studying the principles of language which make a question answerable, and following a scientific procedure in the development of the questionnaire itself.

There are several concepts that are fundamental to the formulation and construction of an answerable question. "The formulation of an answerable question," says Huffman^{2/}, "is fundamental to the scientific method. Research workers are confronted with the problem of formulating questions, for oftentimes the question technic is requisite to making observations which lead to the answers of their original question."

There are many and diverse factors that aid in the development of a good questionnaire. The Research Division of the National Education Association^{3/} is of the belief that, "Every effort should be made to reduce the writing necessary to answer the questionnaire. It should be worded so that the answers may be expressed by yes or no, check marks, underlining or encircling, by figures, or by short answers of a few words."

1/ Harry Huffman, "Improving The Questionnaire As A Tool of Research," The National Business Education Quarterly, (October, 1948) 17:15-18 & p.60.

2/ Ibid., p.18.

3/ Research Division, National Education Association, "The Questionnaire," National Education Association Research Bulletin, (Bulletin 8, 1930) p.21.

Concurring in this observation are Davis and Barrow.^{1/} They are of the belief that, "The majority of questionnaires should be made so constructed that answers could be made by checking the correct word, phrases or number."

The construction of the questionnaire can influence the answer or answers that will be given. Benjamin^{2/} says that, "It is generally recognized that, when multiple choice questionnaires are employed, bias in response can result from the particular order in which the options are arranged. To neutralize such bias, several forms of the same question are frequently prepared, differing only in the order of presentation of the questions and of the optional answers for each question."

There are varied means of having the respondent answer a questionnaire. In addition to those listed above Koos^{3/} maintains that, "A type of response not unlike the yes-or-no type in its simplicity is that of checking the item or items in a series which best describe a practice or best express one's preference. However, it tends to correct the deficiencies of the yes-or-no type by opening-up a wider array of alternatives from which to select and at the same time avoiding restriction to positive and negative responses." One of the advantages of the

^{1/} R. A. Davis and E. L. Barrow, "Critical Study of the Questionnaire in Education," Education Administrator and Supervisor, (February, 1935) 21:137-144. p.143.

^{2/} K. Benjamin, "Combining Responses on Two Forms of a Questionnaire with Options in Inverse Order," Public Opinion Quarterly, (No. 13, 1949) 4:688-690. p.688.

^{3/} Leonard V. Koos, The Questionnaire in Education, The MacMillan Company, New York, 1928. pp.82-83.

Consistent in this observation are Davis and Barrow. They are of the belief that "The majority of questionnaires should be made so constructed that answers could be made by checking the correct word, phrases or number."

The construction of the questionnaire can influence the answer or answers that will be given. Bentzen says that, "It is generally recognized that, when multiple choice questionnaires are employed, bias in responses can result from the particular order in which the options are arranged. To neutralize such bias, several forms of the same question are frequently prepared, differing only in the order of presentation of the questions and of the optional answers for each question."

There are varied means of having the respondent answer a questionnaire. In addition to those listed above Koos maintains that, "A type of response not unlike the yes-or-no type in its simplicity is that of checking the item or items in a series which best describe a practice or best express one's preference. However, it tends to correct the deficiencies of the yes-or-no type by opening up a wider array of alternatives from which to select and at the same time avoiding restriction to positive and negative responses." One of the advantages of the

1/ E. A. Davis and E. L. Barrow, "Critical Study of the Questionnaire in Education," Education Administrator and Supervisor, (February, 1932) 21:137-144, p. 143.

2/ E. Bentzen, "Combining Responses on Two Forms of a Questionnaire with Options in Inverse Order," Public Opinion Quarterly, (No. 13, 1949) 4:682-692, p. 683.

3/ Leonard F. Koos, The Questionnaire in Education, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1932, pp. 82-83.

checking type of responses over some of the other types is that it aids in reducing to negligible proportions the amount of writing that it requires of the respondents.^{1/}

Koos^{2/} has said that, "One may safely conclude that while questionnaires should be as brief as possible, such factors as timeliness, merit of the study, and adequate motivation will often offset the disadvantages of length." However, the Research Division of the National Education Association^{3/} is adamant in its belief that, "Short questionnaires tend to obtain a higher percent of return than long ones."

The major purpose of constructing a questionnaire is to obtain valid results. "Validity," says Parry,^{4/} "is basic to all research and the concept must be made more specific." Koos^{5/} says that, "in questionnaire studies we must be concerned with the proportion of response from those who are approached . . . We are still far from knowing in detail the proportions of responses required to afford a given degree of validity to the findings of our investigations."

In the attempt to abbreviate to a few phrases the apparently important elements in obtaining high returns, the following statements in approximately a descending order of importance are given:

1/ Leonard V. Koos, op. cit., p.124.

2/ Ibid., pp. 131-132.

3/ Research Division, National Education Association, op. cit., pp. 19-20.

4/ Hugh J. Parry and Helen M. Crossley, "Validity of Response to Survey Questions," Public Opinion Quarterly, (No. 14, 1950) 1:61-80. p.61.

5/ Leonard V. Koos, op. cit., p.132.

checking type of responses ever seen of the other types is that it also
in tendency to neglects proportionate the amount of writing that it

regards of the respondents.

Loose has said that, "One may safely conclude that while ques-
tionnaires should be as brief as possible, such factors as timeliness,
variety of the copy, and adequate motivation will often offset the dis-
advantages of length." However, the Research Division of the National
Education Association is adamant in the belief that, "Short question-
naires tend to obtain a higher percent of return than long ones."

The major purpose of constructing a questionnaire is to obtain
valid results. "Validity," says Ferry, "is basic to all research and
the concept must be made very specific." Loose says that, "In question-
naire studies we must be concerned with the proportion of responses from
those who are approached . . . We are still far from knowing in detail
the proportion of responses required to afford a given degree of
validity in the findings of our investigations."

In the attempt to approximate to a few phrases the apparently
important elements in obtaining high returns, the following statements
in approximately a descending order of importance are given:

- 1/ Leonard V. Loose, op. cit., p. 124.
- 2/ Ibid., pp. 131-132.
- 3/ Research Division, National Education Association, op. cit., pp. 19-20.
- 4/ Hugh L. Ferry and Helen H. Crossley, "Validity of Responses to Survey
Questions," Public Opinion Quarterly, (No. 14, 1950) 1:61-80, p. 61.
- 5/ Leonard V. Loose, op. cit., p. 132.

1. The questionnaire should be sent to people who are aware of your professional reputation or who will feel some personal obligation to reply.
2. The best possible technique in writing the questionnaire should be utilized.
3. Construct the questionnaire in such a manner that the respondent will find it easy to reply.
4. Use objective unequivocal but sensible questions. Do not avoid using written answers but be wary of "essay answers."
5. Imply advisedly such incidental pressures as "moral obligation to reply."^{1/}

In addition to the above prerequisites for obtaining high returns are:

1. We should avoid using abstractions or concept words for which philosophers require definition before they begin to argue.
2. The chief protections against a meaningless mess are: Use of concrete words, constant awareness of the problem, inclusion of more than one question, and strict attention to brevity and simplicity.^{2/}
- 3/
Reid says, "There is the obvious importance of preparing a

^{1/} Herbert A. Troops, "Predicting the Returns from Questionnaires: A Study in the Utilization of Qualitative Data," Journal of Experimental Education, (March, 1935) 3:204-215.

^{2/} Stanley L. Payne, "Thoughts about Meaningless Questions," Public Opinion Quarterly, (No. 14, 1950) 4:687-696.

^{3/} S. Reid, "Respondents and Non-respondents to Mail Questionnaires," Educational Research Bulletin, (April, 1942) 21:87-96. p.96.

1. The questionnaire should be sent to people who are aware of your professional reputation or who will feel some personal obligation to reply.

2. The best possible technique in writing the questionnaire should be utilized.

3. Construct the questionnaire in such a manner that the respondent will find it easy to reply.

4. Use objective unambiguous but sensible questions. Do not avoid using written answers but be wary of "easy answers."

5. Reply advantageously such incidental responses as "moral obligation to reply."

In addition to the above prerequisites for obtaining high

return are:

1. We should avoid using abstractions or concept words for which

philosophers require definition before they begin to argue.

2. The chief protection against meaningless mass are: the

of concrete words, constant awareness of the problem, inclusion of more than one question, and strict attention to brevity and simplicity.

Webb says, "There is the obvious importance of preparing a

1/ Herbert A. Brown, "Predicting the Return from Questionnaires: A Study in the Utilization of Qualitative Data," Journal of Experimental Statistics, (March, 1952) 2:200-212.

2/ Stanley L. Payne, "Thoughts about Meaningless Questions," Public Opinion Quarterly, (No. 14, 1950) 14:687-696.

3/ G. Webb, "Respondents and Non-respondents to Mail Questionnaires," National Research Bulletin, (April, 1942) 21:87-96, p. 96.

questionnaire carefully and attractively so as to bring in maximum returns. Everything possible in the way of typography, phraseology, and salesmanship should be done to increase the number of original respondents." In addition to these beliefs Reid^{1/} thinks that the amount of returns are due to many other apparently insignificant factors such as, "the type of individuals to whom questionnaires were sent, the prestige of the investigator, the length of the questionnaire, and the ease with which it can be answered."

Many gratuitous overtures have to be made to entice the respondents to return the questionnaires and Price^{2/} believes strongly that return envelopes are necessary. He says, "In sending out questionnaire through the mail most research workers have never doubted the utility of placing a stamp on the return envelope in order to increase the proportions of returns."

Some of the more salient points to be remembered in constructing the inquiry form are:

1. The directions should be clearly stated and complete.
2. The questions should not, under any circumstances, be complicated.
3. Questions that are of a similar nature should be grouped in order to reduce the need for repetition of directions.
4. Each question should be evaluated carefully in light of the

^{1/} S. Reid, op. cit., p.87.

^{2/} D. O. Price, "On the use of Stamped Return Envelopes with Mail Questionnaires," American Social Research, (October, 1950) 15:672. p.672.

questionnaire carefully and attractively so as to bring in maximum returns. Everything possible in the way of typography, phraseology,

and relationship should be done to increase the number of original responses. In addition to these points, ¹Reid thinks that the amount

of returns are due to many other apparently insignificant factors such as, "the type of individuals to whom questionnaires were sent, the size of the investigator, the length of the questionnaire, and the ease with which it can be answered."

Many previous overtures have to be made to elicit the responses to return the questionnaires and Price ²believes strongly that return envelopes are necessary. He says, "In sending out questionnaire through the mail most research workers have never doubted the utility of placing a stamp on the return envelope in order to increase the proportion of returns."

Some of the more salient points to be remembered in constructing the inquiry form are:

1. The directions should be clearly stated and complete.
2. The questions should not, under any circumstances, be complicated.
3. Questions that are of a similar nature should be grouped in order to reduce the need for repetition of directions.
4. Each question should be evaluated carefully in light of the

¹ S. Reid, op. cit., p. 87.

² B. O. Price, "On the Use of Stamped Return Envelopes with Mail Questionnaires," American Sociological Research, (October, 1950) 15:672. p. 672.

specific purpose it is to fulfill.

5. Each question should be stated in such a manner that it will be conducive to uniformity of interpretation.

6. Each question should be worded and arranged so as to promote ease and, above all, accuracy in the tabulation of data.^{1/}

"Conciseness," declares Romine^{2/}, "consistent with clarity and completeness is the keynote."

Letters of Transmittal:

The statement of the purpose of the questionnaire can be given in two ways according to the Research Division of the National Education Association. The Research Division^{3/} says, "The statement of purpose may be given in a letter of transmittal or in an introductory paragraph on the questionnaire. It should be brief, but adequate, and should not be omitted." These two alternatives are given to the person constructing the questionnaire to work with. Each alternative should be judged in light of the purpose that it is to serve. The Research Division^{4/} continues its explanation of transmittal letters by saying:

A separate letter of transmittal is usually desirable. It offers an opportunity to explain the purpose and extent of the investigation and to give other pertinent information. It should be brief and to the point. Such a letter may be addressed in

^{1/} S. A. Romine, "Criteria for a Better Questionnaire," Journal of Educational Research, (September, 1948) 42:69-71.

^{2/} Ibid., p.71.

^{3/} Research Division, National Education Association, op. cit., p.23.

^{4/} Ibid., p.23.

specific purpose it is to fulfill.

5. Each question should be stated in such a manner that it will

be conducive to uniformity of interpretation.

6. Each question should be worded and arranged so as to promote

ease and, above all, accuracy in the tabulation of data.

"Conciseness," declares Romaine, "consistent with clarity and

completeness is the keynote."

Letters of Transmittal:

The statement of the purpose of the questionnaire can be given

in two ways according to the Research Division of the National Assoc-

tion Association. The Research Division says, "The statement of pur-

pose may be given in a letter of transmittal or in an introductory

paragraph on the questionnaire. It should be brief, but adequate, and

should not be omitted." These two alternatives are given to the person

constructing the questionnaire to work with. Each alternative should

be judged in light of the purpose that it is to serve. The Research

Division continues its explanation of transmittal letters by saying:

A separate letter of transmittal is usually desirable. It offers an opportunity to explain the purpose and extent of the investigation and to give other pertinent information. It should be brief and to the point. Such a letter may be addressed in

Journal of / R. A. Romaine, "Criteria for a Better Questionnaire," Journal of
Educational Research, (September, 1918) 12:82-91.

/ Id., p. 91.

/ Research Division, National Association, op. cit., p. 83.

/ Id., p. 83.

general terms . . . Still better the name and address of the individual receiving the questionnaire may be typewritten on a multi-graphed form.

^{1/}
Moore is of the opinion that, "The typewritten letter of transmittal is more effective in getting questionnaire returns than the duplicated letter of transmittal."

The content of the letter of transmittal has to be carefully planned. It cannot be relegated to a place of minor importance as Koos^{2/} points out, "The character of letters accompanying questionnaires and prepared by the investigator is of much more moment than many novices in questionnaire investigation are wont to believe. These letters should not only explain the project sufficient to make clear the purport of the study but should be so framed as to motivate the recipient to respond."

^{1/} Clarence C. Moore, "Increasing the Returns from Questionnaires," Journal of Educational Research, (October, 1941) 35:138-141.

^{2/} Leonard V. Koos, op.cit., p.124.

General terms . . . Still better the name and address of the individual receiving the questionnaire may be typewritten on a multi-
prepared form.

It is of the opinion that, "The typewritten letter of trans-

mission is more effective in getting questionnaire returns than the

duplicate letter of transmittal."

The content of the letter of transmittal has to be carefully

planned. It cannot be regarded as a place of minor importance as Koss

points out, "The character of letters accompanying questionnaires and

prepared by the investigator is of much more moment than many novices

in questionnaire investigation are wont to believe. These letters

should not only explain the project sufficient to make clear the purpose

of the study but should be so framed as to motivate the recipient to

respond."

1/ Clarence G. Moore, "Increasing the Returns from Questionnaires,"
Journal of Educational Research, (October, 1921) 35:136-141.

2/ Leonard V. Koss, op.cit., p.136.

CHAPTER III

PLAN OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this research project was to determine exactly and specifically whether the "Elementary Evaluative Criteria" is doing what it purports to do.

The writers met with the author to discuss the advisability of attempting to evaluate the instrument. The decision was reached that it was a worthwhile project and had much merit behind it.

The writers went about the task of making an outline of procedures to be followed in the attempt to arrive at the best possible and feasible method of carrying through the research effort.

CHAPTER III

PLAN OF THE STUDY

The vouchers slips of all copies of the evaluative instrument that had been purchased were made available to this group. It was decided that the purchasers and persons using the criteria were the logical people to be queried as to the practicality of the criteria. It was found that these purchasers were located in many sections of the country. In light of this, the writers reviewed research to ascertain the best possible method of obtaining valid responses to the questions that had to be asked. The method decided upon was the mail questionnaire.

In conjunction with this, research pertaining to evaluative criteria was reviewed. The specific conclusions that were drawn from this research are:

1. Modern evaluation uses a variety of techniques of appraisal.

CHAPTER III
PLAN OF THE STUDY

CHAPTER III

PLAN OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this research project was to determine exactly and specifically whether the "Elementary Evaluative Criteria" is doing what it purports to do.

The writers met with the author to discuss the advisability of attempting to evaluate the instrument. The decision was reached that it was a worthwhile project and had much merit behind it.

The writers went about the task of making an outline of procedures to be followed in the attempt to arrive at the best possible and feasible method of carrying through this research effort.

The voucher slips of all copies of the evaluative instrument that had been purchased were made available to this group. It was decided that the purchasers and persons using the criteria were the logical people to be queried as to the practicality of the criteria. It was found that these purchasers were located in many sections of the country. In light of this, the writers reviewed research to ascertain the best possible method of obtaining valid responses to the questions that had to be asked. The method decided upon was the mail questionnaire.

In conjunction with this, research pertaining to evaluative criteria was reviewed. The specific conclusions that were drawn from this research are:

1. Modern evaluation uses a variety of techniques of appraisal.

CHAPTER III PLAN OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this research project was to determine exactly and specifically whether the "Elementary Evaluative Criteria" is doing what it purports to do.

The writer met with the author to discuss the advisability of attempting to evaluate the instrument. The decision was reached that it was a worthwhile project and had much merit behind it.

The writer went about the task of making an outline of procedures to be followed in the attempt to arrive at the best possible and feasible method of carrying through this research effort.

The voucher slips of all copies of the evaluative instrument that had been purchased were made available to this group. It was decided that the purchasers and persons using the criteria were the logical people to be queried as to the practicality of the criteria. It was found that these purchasers were located in many sections of the country. In light of this, the writer reviewed research to ascertain the best possible method of obtaining valid responses to the question that had to be asked. The method decided upon was the mail questionnaire.

In conjunction with this, research pertaining to evaluative criteria was reviewed. The specific conclusions that were drawn from this research are:

1. Modern evaluation uses a variety of techniques of appraisal.

2. Evaluative criteria should attempt to measure a comprehensive range of objectives rather than limited objectives.

3. The questionnaire is a valid means of measuring evaluative criteria in any case where the respondent is not readily accessible to the inquirer.

The Development of the Questionnaire.

In order that the evaluation of the "Elementary Evaluative Criteria" would be reliable and valid, a questionnaire was devised to obtain responses to the information requested. The questionnaire was revised several times before a satisfactory instrument was formed.

Description of the Questionnaire Used in This Study.

The questionnaire form called for three general types of information, namely: a section on the various uses to which the "Elementary Evaluative Criteria" were subjected, a section on the suitability of the contents of the "Elementary Evaluative Criteria" in light of the respondent's personal convictions, and a section on general reactions, which included a space for any suggestions or comments that the respondents cared to make.

The questions that pertained to the section on the various uses to which the criteria were subjected are to be found in Appendix A.

The questions that pertained to the section on the suitability of the contents of the criteria are to be found in Appendix B.

The questions that pertained to the section on the general reactions are to be found in Appendix C.

2. Evaluative criteria should attempt to measure a comprehensive range of objectives rather than limited objectives.

3. The questionnaire is a valid means of securing evaluative criteria in any case where the respondent is not readily accessible to the interviewer.

The Development of the Questionnaire.

In order that the evaluation of the "Elementary Evaluative Criteria" would be reliable and valid, a questionnaire was devised to obtain responses to the information requested. The questionnaire was revised several times before a satisfactory instrument was formed.

Description of the Questionnaire Used in This Study.

The questionnaire form called for three general types of information, namely: a section on the various uses to which the "Elementary Evaluative Criteria" were subjected, a section on the suitability of the contents of the "Elementary Evaluative Criteria" in light of the respondent's personal convictions, and a section on general reactions, which included a space for any suggestions or comments that the respondent cared to make.

The questions that pertained to the section on the various uses to which the criteria were subjected are to be found in Appendix A.

The questions that pertained to the section on the suitability of the contents of the criteria are to be found in Appendix B.

The questions that pertained to the section on the general reactions are to be found in Appendix C.

Description of the Letter of Transmittal.

The writers decided that a separate letter of transmittal explaining the purpose of the study was more appropriate than a separate paragraph on the questionnaire itself. The letter of transmittal was multigraphed. A space was left for the heading and address to be typewritten on the letter. Several revisions of this letter were made before an acceptable form was completed. A copy of this form letter is found in Appendix D.

Description of Practices Utilized to Increase Returns.

It was realized that the greater the number of responses received, the more valid the study would be. A method had to be devised to encourage the respondents to reply. The questionnaire was made as short as practicable. A copy of the complete questionnaire is found in Appendix E.

A copy of the questionnaire, found in Appendix E, and a copy of the letter of transmittal, found in Appendix D, were to be sent to each person who was to be questioned. The writers decided that it would increase results to enclose a stamped, self-addressed envelope for the convenience of the respondents.

Sample of the Study.

The writers did not use selective sampling because a questionnaire was sent to each person who had purchased a copy or copies of the criteria directly from the publisher, regardless of the purchase date or the position of the purchaser. This, in itself, would indicate that

Description of the Letter of Transmittal.

The writers decided that a separate letter of transmittal explaining the purpose of the study was more appropriate than a separate paragraph on the questionnaire itself. The letter of transmittal was typographed. A space was left for the heading and address to be typed on the letter. Several revisions of this letter were made before an acceptable form was completed. A copy of this form letter is found in Appendix B.

Description of Practices Utilized to Increase Response.

It was realized that the greater the number of responses received, the more valid the study would be. A method had to be devised to encourage the respondents to reply. The questionnaire was made as short as practicable. A copy of the complete questionnaire is found in Appendix E.

A copy of the questionnaire, found in Appendix E, and a copy of the letter of transmittal, found in Appendix B, were to be sent to each person who was to be questioned. The writers decided that it would increase results to enclose a stamped, self-addressed envelope for the convenience of the respondents.

Sample of the Study.

The writers did not use selective sampling because a questionnaire was sent to each person who had purchased a copy or copies of the criteria directly from the publisher, regardless of the purchase date or the position of the purchaser. This, in itself, would indicate that

low returns were to be expected due to the fact that many of the purchasers had no opportunity to make use of the criteria and therefore made no reply.

Distribution of the Questionnaire.

The questionnaire, accompanied by the material listed above, was mailed to 493 purchasers. Of the 493 purchasers, 168 had purchased five or more copies. The purchasers are to be found in many sections of the country.

Percentage of Returns.

A total of 215 answers were received by the deadline that was established by the writers. The deadline was set as February 10, 1955. The first questionnaires were sent out on November 17, 1954. February 10, 1955 was set as a deadline in order that the writers could tabulate the results in time to complete the study.

Handling the Returns.

A mailing list was kept by the writers of all questionnaires that were sent out. As each questionnaire was returned, it was checked off the mailing list and recorded on a separate sheet. A master chart was set up to tabulate the results of the responses to the questionnaires. As these responses were tabulated, an indication was made on the returned questionnaire to indicate that the information had been included on the master chart.

low returns were to be expected due to the fact that many of the purchasers had no opportunity to make use of the criteria and therefore made no reply.

Distribution of the Questionnaire.

The questionnaire, accompanied by the material listed above, was mailed to 103 purchasers. Of the 103 purchasers, 108 had purchased five or more copies. The purchasers are to be found in many sections of the country.

Percentage of Returns.

A total of 215 answers were received by the deadline that was established by the writers. The deadline was set as February 10, 1955. The first questionnaires were sent out on November 17, 1954. February 10, 1955 was set as a deadline in order that the writers could tabulate the results in time to complete the study.

Handling the Returns.

A mailing list was kept by the writers of all questionnaires that were sent out. As each questionnaire was returned, it was checked off the mailing list and recorded on a separate sheet. A master chart was set up to tabulate the results of the responses to the questionnaires. As these responses were tabulated, an indication was made on the returned questionnaire to indicate that the information had been included on the master chart.

CHAPTER IV

THE ANALYSIS OF DATA

The questionnaire, described in Chapter III and the Appendixes, was built for purposes of inventory and survey. It was designed to elicit valid responses as to the effectiveness of "The Elementary Evaluative Criteria" as an evaluating instrument. An analysis of these data centers around the responses that the respondents indicated. This survey was also conducted for the purpose of attempting to find out if any particular section of the criteria needed revision. Some of the respondents made comments regarding suggested revisions. These, while not statistically accurate, were considered to be very important and are included in the analysis of data.

CHAPTER IV

THE ANALYSIS OF DATA

The data have been analyzed in four ways. The questionnaires were sent to persons purchasing one to four copies, and persons purchasing five or more copies. It was believed that it would be more meaningful to analyze the data as follows:

- 1) An analysis was made of all replies.
- 2) A separate analysis was made of those persons purchasing five or more copies.
- 3) An analysis was made of general comments from persons purchasing one to four copies of the criteria.
- 4) An analysis was made of general comments from persons purchasing five or more copies of the criteria.

CHAPTER IV
THE ANALYSIS OF DATA

THE ANALYSIS OF DATA

The questionnaire, described in Chapter III and the Appendices, was built for purposes of inventory and survey. It was designed to elicit valid responses as to the effectiveness of "The Elementary Evaluative Criteria" as an evaluating instrument. An analysis of these data centers around the responses that the respondents indicated. This survey was also conducted for the purpose of attempting to find out if any particular section of the criteria needed revision. Some of the respondents made comments regarding their suggested revisions. These, while not statistically accurate, are believed to be very important and are included in the analysis of data.

The data have been analyzed in four ways. The questionnaires were sent to persons purchasing one to four copies, and persons purchasing five or more copies. It was believed that it would be more meaningful to analyze the data as follows:

- 1) An analysis was made of all replies.
- 2) A separate analysis was made of those persons purchasing five or more copies.
- 3) An analysis was made of general comments from persons purchasing one to four copies of the criteria.
- 4) An analysis was made of general comments from persons purchasing five or more copies of the criteria.

CHAPTER IV

THE ANALYSIS OF DATA

The questionnaire, described in Chapter III and the Appendix, was built for purposes of inventory and survey. It was designed to elicit valid responses as to the effectiveness of "The Elementary English Critique" as an evaluating instrument. An analysis of these data centers around the responses that the respondents indicated. This survey was also conducted for the purpose of attempting to find out if any particular section of the criteria needed revision. Some of the respondents made comments regarding their suggested revisions. These, while not statistically accurate, are believed to be very important and are included in the analysis of data.

The data have been analyzed in four ways. The questionnaires were sent to persons purchasing one to four copies, and persons purchasing five or more copies. It was believed that it would be more meaningful to analyze the data as follows:

- 1) An analysis was made of all replies.
- 2) A separate analysis was made of those persons purchasing five or more copies.
- 3) An analysis was made of general comments from persons purchasing one to four copies of the criteria.
- 4) An analysis was made of general comments from persons purchasing five or more copies of the criteria.

Tables I through VI are computed on the basis of 215 responses. These comprise the total number obtained in answer to the questionnaire.

Tables VII through XI are computed on the basis of seventy-nine replies. These comprise all respondents who purchased five or more copies of the criteria.

Evaluation of a total school system	31	14.41
Evaluation of a single school	51	23.72
Evaluation of one phase of the program	60	27.90
Basis for discussion at teacher's meetings	93	43.25
Study groups, resources, or reference materials	93	43.25
No use designated	22	10.23

Table I indicates that twenty-two respondents or 10.23 per cent of the total number of replies received made no response as to the use they subjected the criteria. Thirty-one persons or 14.41 per cent used the criteria to evaluate a total school system. The majority of these thirty-one persons belonged to the group who had purchased five or more copies of the criteria. Ninety-three persons or 43.25 per cent of the total group used the criteria as a basis for discussion at teacher's meetings. The same answer applies as to the use in study groups, as resources, or reference materials. Many of the respondents used the criteria for more than one purpose and so indicated by checking in the appropriate places.

Table II indicates the responses that were made as to the suitability or unsuitability of the criteria. Negligible responses were made pertaining to the deletion of any section of the criteria. Kinder-

Tables I through VI are computed on the basis of 215 responses. These comprise the total number obtained in answer to the questionnaire. Tables VII through XI are computed on the basis of seventy-nine replies. These comprise all respondents who purchased five or more copies of the criteria.

TABLE I

PURPOSES FOR WHICH THE CRITERIA WERE USED

<u>Type of Use</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Evaluation of a total school system	31	14.41
Evaluation of a single school	51	23.72
Evaluation of one phase of the program	60	27.90
Basis for discussion at teacher's meetings	93	43.25
Study groups, resources, or reference materials	93	43.25
No use designated	22	10.23

Table I indicates that twenty-two respondents or 10.23 per cent of the total number of replies received made no response as to the use they subjected the criteria. Thirty-one persons or 14.41 per cent used the criteria to evaluate a total school system. The majority of these thirty-one persons belonged to the group who had purchased five or more copies of the criteria. Ninety-three persons or 43.25 per cent of the total group used the criteria as a basis for discussion at teacher's meetings. The same number applies as to its use in study groups, as resources, or reference materials. Many of the respondents used the criteria for more than one purpose and so indicated by checking in the appropriate places.

Table II indicates the responses that were made as to the suitability or unsuitability of the criteria. Negligible responses were made pertaining to the deletion of any section of the criteria. Kinder-

TABLE I
PURPOSES FOR WHICH THE CRITERIA WERE USED

Type of Use	Number	Per Cent
Evaluation of a total school system	31	11.41
Evaluation of a single school	51	23.75
Evaluation of one phase of the program	60	27.90
Basis for discussion at teacher's meetings	93	43.25
Study groups, resources, or reference materials	93	43.25
No use designated	22	10.23

Table I indicates that twenty-two respondents or 10.23 per cent of the total number of replies received made no response as to the use they subjected the criteria. Thirty-one persons or 11.41 per cent used the criteria to evaluate a total school system. The majority of these thirty-one persons belonged to the group who had purchased five or more copies of the criteria. Ninety-three persons or 43.25 per cent of the total group used the criteria as a basis for discussion at teacher's meetings. The same number applies as to its use in study groups, as resources, or reference materials. Many of the respondents used the criteria for more than one purpose and so indicated by checking in the appropriate places.

Table II indicates the responses that were made as to the utility or unavailability of the criteria. Negligible responses were made pertaining to the deletion of any section of the criteria. Kinder-

TABLE II
RATINGS DESIGNATED TO VARIOUS SECTIONS OF THE CRITERIA

Sections of Criteria	Satisfactory		Needs Revision		Delete		No Comment	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Manual	86	40.00	3	1.40	0	.00	126	58.60
Philosophy of Objectives	82	38.13	8	3.72	0	.00	125	58.13
Kindergarten	79	36.74	5	2.32	2	.93	129	60.00
Arithmetic	83	38.60	5	2.32	1	.46	126	58.60
Arts & Crafts	81	37.67	10	4.65	0	.00	124	57.67
Health & Physical Education	76	35.34	9	4.18	0	.00	120	55.81
Language Arts	82	38.13	9	4.18	0	.00	124	57.67
Music	79	36.74	4	1.86	0	.00	132	61.39
Science	83	38.60	2	.93	0	.00	130	60.46
Social Studies	78	36.27	7	3.25	1	.46	129	60.00
Library Services	78	36.27	5	2.32	1	.46	131	60.93
Guidance Services	78	36.27	9	4.18	2	.93	126	58.60
School Plant	80	37.20	4	1.86	0	.00	131	60.93
School Staff & Administration	80	37.20	6	2.79	0	.00	129	60.00
Individual Staff Member Data Sheet	78	36.27	5	2.32	1	.46	131	60.93

TABLE II
RATINGS DESIGNATED TO VARIOUS SECTIONS OF THE CRITERIA

Sections of Criteria	Satisfactory				Needs Revision				Delete		No Comment
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Manual	86	40.00	3	1.40	0	.00	126	58.60			
Philosophy of Objectives	82	38.13	8	3.75	0	.00	125	58.13			
Kindergarten	79	36.74	5	2.35	5	.93	129	60.00			
Arithmetic	83	38.60	5	2.35	1	.46	126	58.60			
Art & Crafts	81	37.67	10	4.65	0	.00	124	57.67			
Health & Physical Education	76	35.34	9	4.18	0	.00	120	55.81			
Language Arts	85	38.13	9	4.18	0	.00	124	57.67			
Music	79	36.74	4	1.86	0	.00	132	61.39			
Science	83	38.60	5	.93	0	.00	130	60.46			
Social Studies	78	36.27	7	3.25	1	.46	129	60.00			
Library Services	78	36.27	5	2.35	1	.46	131	60.93			
Guidance Services	78	36.27	9	4.18	5	.93	126	58.60			
School Plant	80	37.20	4	1.86	0	.00	131	60.93			
School Staff & Administration	80	37.20	6	2.79	0	.00	129	60.00			
Individual Staff Member Data Sheet	76	35.27	5	2.35	1	.46	131	60.93			

garten and guidance services sections received the highest per cent of responses as pertaining to deletion and this percentage fails to reach one per cent. The comments that accompanied the returns indicated to the writers that the persons who advocated deletions, in most cases, were those who did not have that particular phase of the criteria included in their school program.

The "no comment" section leads in percentage. This was to be expected due to the fact that many of the respondents used the criteria for study groups and other related projects. (See Table I) The respondents who used the criteria in study groups, etc., had no valid means of judging the criteria and so indicated in their written comments.

The respondents who indicated that the criteria needed revision made written comment, in some cases, as to the amount and type of revision that needed to be done. In all cases where a need of revision is indicated the percentage is very low.

The percentage of respondents who made an indication as to the suitability of the criteria is very high if the "no comments" are discarded.

Written and guidance sections received the highest per cent of responses as pertaining to deletion and this percentage failed to reach one per cent. The comments that accompanied the returns indicated to the writers that the persons who advocated deletion, in most cases, were those who did not have that particular phase of the criteria included in their school program.

The "no comments" section found in percentage. This was to be expected due to the fact that many of the respondents used the criteria for study groups and other related projects. (See Table I) The respondents who used the criteria in study groups, etc., had no valid means of judging the criteria and so indicated in their written comments.

The respondents who indicated that the criteria needed revision were indicated current, in some cases, as to the amount and type of revision that needed to be done. In all cases where a need of revision is indicated the percentage is very low.

The percentage of respondents who made an indication as to the validity of the criteria is very high if the "no comments" are discarded.

EFFICIENCY BRAND
NO CONTENT

TABLE III
GENERAL REACTIONS TO CRITERIA

A. Adequacy of instructions for rating checklists and evaluations				B. Needs further integration and coordination			
Adequate		Inadequate		Yes		No	
Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
105	48.83	11	5.11	49	22.79	31	14.41

Table III begins the analysis of data pertaining to Section III of the questionnaire. (See Appendix C) Table III is divided into two parts, A and B.

In part A, 116 respondents made a reply as to the adequacy of the instruction for rating checklists and evaluation. 105 or 48.83 per cent stated that the instructions were adequate, while 11 persons or 5.11 per cent stated that the instructions were inadequate. Ninety-nine persons made no comment.

Part B concerns itself with the need for further integration and coordination between the various subject areas found in the criteria. Forty-nine persons or 22.79 per cent stated that further integration and coordination between the subject areas was needed. Thirty-one or 14.41 per cent stated that there was no need for further integration and coordination between subject areas.

TABLE III
GENERAL REACTIONS TO CRITERIA

A. Adequacy of instructions for rating checklists and evaluation		B. Needs further instruction and coordination	
Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
105	48.83	11	5.11
		22	22.73
		31	31.11
		40	40.00

Table III begins the analysis of data pertaining to Section III of the questionnaire. (See Appendix C) Table III is divided into two parts, A and B.

In part A, 110 respondents made a reply as to the adequacy of the instruction for rating checklists and evaluation. 105 or 48.83 per cent stated that the instructions were adequate, while 11 persons or 5.11 per cent stated that the instructions were inadequate. Ninety-nine persons made no comment.

Part B concerns itself with the need for further instruction and coordination between the various subject areas found in the criteria. Forty-nine persons or 22.73 per cent stated that further instruction and coordination between the subject areas was needed. Thirty-one or 15.11 per cent stated that there was no need for further instruction and coordination between subject areas.

TABLE IV
POSITION OF INDIVIDUAL FILLING OUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE

<u>Type of Position</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Administrator	148	68.83
Supervisor	19	8.83
Teacher	6	2.79
No Comment	42	19.53

Table IV is an indication of the positions held by the respondents. The highest per cent of returns came from administrators. This group, administrators, is comprised of principals, superintendents, and, in some cases, members of boards of education.

TABLE V
USE OF THE CRITERIA WITH LAY PERSONNEL

<u>Number of communities using criteria with laymen</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
29	13.48

Table V indicates the number and percentage of the total number of communities using the criteria with laymen. This number may not be the total number of communities using the criteria with laymen, but it does indicate the number of respondents who indicated on their questionnaire that they had used the criteria with laymen.

TABLE IV
POSITION OF INDIVIDUAL FILLING OUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Type of Position	Number	Per Cent
Administrator	118	68.83
Supervisor	19	8.83
Teacher	6	2.79
No Comment	15	19.53

Table IV is an indication of the positions held by the respondents. The highest per cent of returns came from administrators. This group, administrators, is comprised of principals, superintendents, and, in some cases, members of boards of education.

TABLE V
USE OF THE CRITERIA WITH LAY PERSONNEL

Number of communities using criteria with laymen	Per Cent
29	13.48

Table V indicates the number and percentage of the total number of communities using the criteria with laymen. This number may not be the total number of communities using the criteria with laymen, but it does indicate the number of respondents who indicated on their questionnaire that they had used the criteria with laymen.

TABLE VI
IMPROVEMENT INDICATED IN COMMUNITIES USING CRITERIA

<u>Degree of Improvement</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Extensive	8	3.72
Some	72	33.48
None	4	1.86

Table VI is an indication of the degree of improvement in the school systems of eighty-four respondents. The remaining 130 respondents were noncommittal as to the extent of improvement in their school systems. Of the eighty-four replies to this question, seventy-two or 33.48 per cent stated that the use of the criteria had brought about some improvement.

Tables VII through XI consist of an analysis of data as computed on the basis of responses from persons who purchased five or more copies of the "Elementary Evaluative Criteria."

Library Services	26	32.91	3	3.79	1	1.26	49	62.02
Guidance Services	25	31.04	6	7.59	2	2.53	46	58.32
School Plant	30	37.97	2	2.53	0	.00	47	59.49
School Staff & Administration	29	36.70	4	5.06	0	.00	46	58.22
Individual Staff	28	35.44	3	3.79	1	1.26	47	59.49

TABLE VI

IMPROVEMENT INDICATED IN COMMUNITIES USING CRITERIA

Degree of Improvement		
Number	Per Cent	
Extensive	8	3.72
Some	72	33.48
None	4	1.86

Table VI is an indication of the degree of improvement in the school systems of eighty-four respondents. The remaining 130 respondents were noncommittal as to the extent of improvement in their school systems. Of the eighty-four replies to this question, seventy-two or 85.71 per cent stated that the use of the criteria had brought about some improvement.

Tables VII through XI consist of an analysis of data as computed on the basis of responses from persons who purchased five or more copies of the "Elementary Evaluative Criteria."

TABLE VII

RATINGS DESIGNATED TO VARIOUS SECTIONS OF THE CRITERIA

Sections of Criteria	Satisfactory		Needs Revision		Delete		No Comment	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Manual	29	36.70	2	2.53	0	.00	48	60.75
Philosophy & Objectives	30	37.97	1	1.26	0	.00	48	60.75
Kindergarten	26	32.91	4	5.06	1	1.26	48	60.75
Arithmetic	32	40.50	3	3.79	0	.00	44	55.69
Arts & Crafts	27	34.17	5	6.32	0	.00	47	59.49
Health & Physical Education	25	31.64	7	8.86	0	.00	47	59.49
Language Arts	30	37.97	5	6.32	0	.00	44	55.69
Music	29	36.70	2	2.53	0	.00	48	60.75
Science	30	37.97	1	1.26	0	.00	48	60.75
Social Studies	28	35.44	5	6.32	1	1.26	46	58.22
Library Services	26	32.91	3	3.79	1	1.26	49	62.02
Guidance Services	25	31.64	6	7.59	2	2.53	46	58.22
School Plant	30	37.97	2	2.53	0	.00	47	59.49
School Staff & Administration	29	36.70	4	5.06	0	.00	46	58.22
Individual Staff Member Data Sheet	28	35.44	3	3.79	1	1.26	47	59.49

TABLE VII

RATINGS DESIGNATED TO VARIOUS SECTIONS OF THE CRITERIA

Sections of Criteria	Satisfactory		Needs Revision		Defect		No Comment	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Manual	29	36.70	2	2.53	0	0.00	18	60.75
Philosophy & Objectives	30	37.97	1	1.26	0	0.00	18	60.75
Kindergarten	26	32.91	1	2.06	1	1.26	18	60.75
Artistic	32	40.50	3	3.79	0	0.00	14	25.69
Arts & Crafts	27	34.17	2	6.32	0	0.00	17	29.19
Health & Physical Education	25	31.61	7	8.86	0	0.00	17	29.19
Language Arts	30	37.97	2	6.32	0	0.00	14	25.69
Music	29	36.70	2	2.53	0	0.00	18	60.75
Sciences	30	37.97	1	1.26	0	0.00	18	60.75
Social Studies	28	32.14	2	6.32	1	1.26	16	28.52
Library Services	26	32.91	3	3.79	1	1.26	19	62.02
Guidance Services	25	31.61	6	7.59	2	2.53	16	28.52
School Plant	30	37.97	2	2.53	0	0.00	17	29.19
School Staff & Administration	29	36.70	1	2.06	0	0.00	16	28.52
Individual Staff Member Data Sheet	28	32.14	3	3.79	1	1.26	17	29.19

Table VII indicates the responses that were made as to the suitability or unsuitability of the criteria. This table should be compared to Table II to obtain an over-all picture. This table indicates that negligible responses were made pertaining to the deletion of any section of the criteria. When compared with Table II the reader will notice that almost all of the recommendations for deletion came from the group that purchased five or more copies of the criteria.

The "No Comment" section is high in number and percentage. The reason for this is the same as is applicable to Table II. (See Table II and explanation).

When compared to Table II the percentage of respondents indicating that the criteria needs revision in certain areas is slightly higher in Table VII. This may be significant. The percentage has not increased to a marked degree in any specific area but it would be worthwhile to note the correlation between Table II and Table VII.

The percentage of respondents who made an indication as to the suitability of the criteria is very high, as is the case in Table II, if the "No Comment" section is deleted.

Table VII indicates the responses that were made as to the suitability or unsuitability of the criteria. This table should be compared to Table II to obtain an over-all picture. This table indicates that negligible responses were made pertaining to the deletion of any section of the criteria. When compared with Table II the reader will notice that almost all of the recommendations for deletion came from the group that purchased five or more copies of the criteria.

The "No Comment" section is high in number and percentage. The reason for this is the same as is applicable to Table II. (See Table II and explanation).

When compared to Table II the percentage of respondents indicating that the criteria needs revision in certain areas is slightly higher in Table VII. This may be significant. The percentage has not increased to a marked degree in any specific area but it would be worthwhile to note the correlation between Table II and Table VII.

The percentage of respondents who made an indication as to the suitability of the criteria is very high, as is the case in Table II, if the "No Comment" section is deleted.

TABLE VIII

POSITION OF GENERAL REACTIONS TO CRITERIA

A. Adequacy of instructions for rating checklists and evaluations				B. Needs further integration and coordination			
Adequate		Inadequate		Yes		No	
Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
41	51.89	2	2.53	15	18.98	17	21.51

Table VIII should be compared with Table III.

Part A. Forty-one respondents or 51.89 per cent of the persons who purchased five or more copies of the criteria stated that the instructions for rating checklists and evaluation were adequate. Two persons or 2.53 per cent of this group stated that the instructions were inadequate.

Part B. Fifteen persons or 18.98 per cent stated that the criteria need further integration and coordination. Seventeen persons or 21.51 per cent of the group stated that there was no need for further integration and coordination.

TABLE VIII

GENERAL REACTIONS TO CRITERIA

A. Adequacy of instructions for rating checklists and evaluations		B. Needs further integration and coordination		Number		Per Cent		Number		Per Cent		Number		Per Cent	
Adequate		Inadequate		Yes		No									
14	21.89	2	2.53	15	18.98	17	21.51								

Table VIII should be compared with Table III.

Part A. Forty-one respondents or 21.89 per cent of the persons

who purchased five or more copies of the criteria stated that the

instructions for rating checklists and evaluation were adequate. Two

persons or 2.53 per cent of this group stated that the instructions were

inadequate.

Part B. Fifteen persons or 18.98 per cent stated that the criteria

need further integration and coordination. Seventeen persons or 21.51

per cent of the group stated that there was no need for further integra-

tion and coordination.

TABLE IX
POSITION OF INDIVIDUAL FILLING OUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE

<u>Type of Position</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Administrator	43	54.43
Supervisor	7	8.86
Teacher	0	.00
No Comment	29	36.70

Table IX is an indication of the positions held by the respondents who purchased five or more copies. (For comparative purposes see Table IV) As in Table IV the highest per cent of returns came from the administrators. This group is comprised of principals, superintendents, and in some cases, members of boards of education.

TABLE IX
POSITION OF INDIVIDUAL FILLING OUT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

Type of Position	Number	Per Cent
Administrator	13	54.13
Supervisor	7	8.86
Teacher	0	.00
No Comment	29	36.70

Table IX is an indication of the positions held by the respondents who purchased five or more copies. (For comparative purposes see Table IV) As in Table IV the highest per cent of returns came from the administrators. This group is comprised of principals, superintendents, and in some cases, members of boards of education.

TABLE X

USE OF THE CRITERIA WITH LAY PERSONNEL

<u>Number of communities using criteria with laymen</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
9	11.39

Table X indicates that only nine communities used the criteria with laymen participating in its use. Table V, and Table X indicate the number of respondents who indicated on their questionnaire that they had used the criteria with laymen.

The remaining respondents made no indication whether they used the criteria with laymen or not.

Analysis of Comments.

The persons who purchased one to four copies made several general comments that should be considered in the analysis of data. The following comments are obtained from the written comments that were directed to the writers in answer to their request for comments concerning the criteria:

General Nature Comments.

"Elementary Evaluative Criteria has been used by a limited number of teachers. We are planning to use the material more extensively later this year and next year. Those who have studied the criteria feel that it will be very valuable to help us in the improvement of our work. It is excellent."

"My comments are very general. I believe your criteria make it hard to evaluate a school or system which is trying to fuse regular matter into new-testing experiences. The break between content and

TABLE I

USE OF THE CRITERIA WITH JAPANESE PERSONNEL

Per Cent	Number of communities using criteria with Japanese
11.39	9

Table I indicates that only nine communities used the criteria with Japanese participating in its use. Table V, and Table X indicate the number of respondents who indicated on their questionnaire that they had used the criteria with Japanese.

The remaining respondents made no indication whether they used the criteria with Japanese or not.

TABLE XI
IMPROVEMENT INDICATED IN COMMUNITIES USING CRITERIA

<u>Degree of Improvement</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Extensive	4	5.63
Some	31	39.24
None	4	5.63

Table XI is based on seventy-nine replies. Thirty-nine respondents answered this question. The majority of those that answered stated that the use of the criteria brought about some improvement in their school systems.

Analysis of Comments.

The persons who purchased one to four copies made several general comments that should be considered in the analysis of data. The following comments are obtained from the written comments that were directed to the writers in answer to their request for comments concerning the criteria:

General Nature Comments.

"Elementary Evaluative Criteria has been used by a limited number of teachers. We are planning to use the material more extensively later this year and next year. Those who have studied the criteria feel that it will be very valuable to help us in the improvement of our work. It is excellent."

"My comments are very general. I believe your criteria make it hard to evaluate a school or system which is trying to fuse segment matter into need-meeting experiences. The break between content and

TABLE XI
IMPROVEMENT INDICATED IN COMMUNITIES USING CRITERIA

<u>Degree of Improvement</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Extensive	1	2.63
Some	31	39.24
None	1	2.63

Table XI is based on seventy-nine replies. Thirty-nine respondents answered this question. The majority of those that answered stated that the use of the criteria brought about some improvement in their school systems.

Analysis of Comments.

The persons who purchased one to four copies made several general comments that should be considered in the analysis of data. The following comments are obtained from the written comments that were directed to the writers in answer to their request for comments concerning the criteria:

General Nature Comments.

"Elementary Evaluative Criteria has been used by a limited number of teachers. We are planning to use this material more extensively later this year and next year. Those who have utilized the criteria feel that it will be very valuable to help us in the improvement of our work. It is excellent."

"My comments are very general. I believe your criteria make it hard to evaluate a school or system which is trying to fine segment matter into need-meeting experiences. The break between content and

method is both awkward and miseducative for our teachers. The type of activities you have used seems to me to be too close to the Evaluative Criteria for Secondary Schools, rather than an example for the revision of this work.

I do believe this has been a step ahead which we need. However I hope you will basically revise your criteria, introducing an organization and a structure which will help teachers and administrators to move in the direction of the best educational knowledge which we now have.

It seems that somewhere there should be a place for evaluation of activities, interpersonal relations between staff, staff and administration, staff and students, staff and parents, pervading atmosphere of school, system, and classrooms, schools and system. Particularly the latter two are neglected."

"Although we have taken a somewhat different approach than many of your parts, they seem satisfactory for general use."

"Since the personality of the administrator and the teacher is so important in the teaching-learning situation, it might be well to have a check list on personal characteristics.

While it is necessary to check on each subject taught, I think some provision should be made for evaluating large units of work which should be carried on to give children experience in planning, organizing, and in making use of skills taught in several areas."

"We found it very useful and informative."

Speaking of Section II, ". . . all of these allow for much reasonable variation. The criteria is provocative."

"I have used the Elementary Evaluative Criteria to help me as a principal--to be more exact in my goals--to clarify them with the staff, superintendent and P. T. A. It is a definite help.

I am particularly interested in seeing that we meet the needs of the pupils in a changing community. A careful check has been needed; the Evaluative Criteria has answered that need."

"I think there is some helpful material in your program and I would like to encourage your keeping it in production for the use of public schools."

Pertaining to Section II. "I find these areas very inclusive."

"The criteria definitely aided in improving the sequential relationships of the subjects mentioned, mathematics and science. It

method is both awkward and misdirective for our teachers. The type of activities you have used seems to me to be too close to the Evaluative Criteria for Secondary Schools, rather than an example for the revision of this work.

I do believe this has been a step ahead which we need. However I hope you will basically revise your criteria, introducing an organization and a structure which will help teachers and administrators to move in the direction of the best educational knowledge which we now have.

It seems that somewhere there should be a place for evaluation of activities, interpersonal relations between staff, staff and administration, staff and students, staff and parents, pervading atmosphere of school, system, and classrooms, schools and system. Particularly the latter two are neglected.

"Although we have taken a somewhat different approach than many of your people, they seem satisfactory for general use."

"Since the personality of the administrator and the teacher is so important in the teaching-learning situation, it might be well to have a check list on personal characteristics."

While it is necessary to check on each subject taught, I think some provision should be made for evaluating large units of work which should be carried on to give children experience in planning, organizing, and in making use of skills taught in several areas."

"We found it very useful and informative."

Speaking of Section II, "... all of these allow for much reasonable variation. The criteria is provocative."

"I have used the Elementary Evaluative Criteria to help me as a principal--to be more exact in my goals--to clarify them with the staff, superintendent and P. T. A. It is a definite help."

I am particularly interested in seeing that we meet the needs of the pupils in a changing community. A careful check has been needed; the Evaluative Criteria has answered that need."

"I think there is some helpful material in your program and I would like to encourage your keeping it in production for the use of public schools."

Pertaining to Section II, "I find these areas very inclusive."

"The criteria definitely aided in improving the sequential relationships of the subjects mentioned, mathematics and science. It

gave the teachers an opportunity to cooperate with each other successfully with the equipment offered for teaching purposes. Thus overlapping was almost completely eliminated."

"Section II in your questionnaire was answered 'satisfactorily' because I feel your brochure indicated a work carefully considered and well developed. However in any reference of this type the important aspect is the encouragement offered to a staff in the planning of a means of evaluation that derives from our situation. In such a planning is growth and understanding and that is when our basic objectives are served."

Checklists.

"One instruction we think needs more emphasis is that teachers may talk over checklists but not evaluation questions before their evaluation of each area."

"Simplify checklist and evaluations. Marks for checklist items could be letters or numbers or words--shorter list."

Arts and Crafts.

"We feel that the arts and crafts are more suitable for a junior high school. This section has been revised by our art department for our use."

Integration and Evaluation.

"In our present situation in many elementary schools of South Dakota, I feel that much can be accomplished by taking a close look at the various areas of the curriculum. The amount of training of the teachers involved does not warrant too much attention to integration and coordination of subject areas as yet. Perhaps another set of criteria for use by schools ready for the next step might be in order rather than changing your present publication."

Language Arts.

"Checklists are too complete and detailed. No school would want to be able to check affirmatively all items, yet the impression given is that the more items that can be checked the better is the school."

Many items are applicable only to certain age levels. It would be advisable to group primary and intermediate grade items separately.

gave the teachers an opportunity to cooperate with each other success-
fully in the equipment offered for teaching purposes. Thus overlapping
was almost completely eliminated."

"Section II in your questionnaire was answered 'satisfactorily'
because I feel your procedure indicated a work carefully considered and
well developed. However in my reference of this type the important
aspect is the encouragement offered to a staff in the planning of a
series of evaluation that derives from our situation. In such a planning
is growth and understanding and that is when our basic objectives are
served."

Checklists.

"Our instruction we think needs more emphasis is that teachers
may take over checklists but not evaluation questions before their
evaluation of each area."

"Simplify checklist and evaluations. Markers for checklist items
could be letters or numbers or words--shorter list."

Arts and Crafts.

"We feel that the arts and crafts are more suitable for a Junior
high school. This section has been revised by our art department for
our use."

Integration and Evaluation.

"In our present situation in many elementary schools of South
Dakota, I feel that much can be accomplished by taking a close look at
the various areas of the curriculum. The amount of training of the
teachers involved does not warrant too much attention to integration and
coordination of subject areas as yet. Perhaps another set of criteria
for use by schools ready for the next step might be in order rather than
changing your present publication."

Language Arts.

"Checklists are too complete and detailed. No school would want
to be able to check affirmatively all items, yet the impression given is
that the more items that can be checked the better is the school."

Many items are applicable only to certain age levels. It would
be advisable to group primary and intermediate grade items separately.

Page 101, seems unnecessary."

Philosophy.

"At the elementary level we are concerned about the attention we should give the 'core program' and the general integration of related subject fields. Your evaluative criteria in neither philosophy section or curriculum section makes evaluation of this type of program possible or perhaps we should say reasonable."

The following comments were made by those respondents who purchased five or more copies of the criteria:

General Nature Comments.

"We have found the material a little 'wordy.' We have also not been able to follow the suggested time schedule, as discussion of so many points has been quite lengthy. It is an excellent publication and we are enjoying its use according to our needs."

"Seems to be a fine, practical attempt to give concrete aid rather than philosophical malapropisms."

"I want to say that your instrument is easily the best and most complete criteria we could find. Some parts of it were supplemented but, on the whole, I would have to check all parts of it as being satisfactory. It certainly served our purpose admirably. . . . You are doing pioneer work in this field. I am sure you will make changes and improvements as you go on. There isn't much in the way of criteria by which to measure your materials, so it seems essential that progress or change be conservative. . . . your instrument is, in my opinion, the finest work of this nature available."

Integration.

"I would like to see more integration of art, music, and physical education with the other subjects possibly through the unit method."

Philosophy.

"Philosophy and objectives could be developed more completely."

"Too little emphasis is put on philosophy."

Philosophy.

"At the elementary level we are concerned about the attention we should give the 'core program' and the general integration of related subject fields. Your evaluative criteria in neither philosophy section or curriculum section makes evaluation of this type of program possible or perhaps we should say reasonable."

The following comments were made by those respondents who pur-

chased five or more copies of the criteria:

General Nature Comments.

"We have found the material a little 'wordy.' We have also not been able to follow the suggested time schedule, as discussion of so many points has been quite lengthy. It is an excellent publication and we are enjoying it as according to our needs."

"Seems to be a fine, practical attempt to give concrete aid rather than philosophical malapropisms."

"I want to say that your instrument is easily the best and most complete criteria we could find. Some parts of it were supplemented but on the whole, I would have to check all parts of it as being satisfactory. It certainly served our purpose admirably. . . . You are doing pioneer work in this field. I am sure you will make changes and improvements as you go on. There isn't much in the way of criteria by which to measure your materials, so it seems essential that progress or change be conservative. . . . Your instrument is, in my opinion, the finest work of this nature available."

Integration.

"I would like to see more integration of art, music, and physical education with the other subjects possibly through the unit method."

Philosophy.

"Philosophy and objectives could be developed more completely."

"Too little emphasis is put on philosophy."

Library Services.

"We do not find central library as functional as the rotation use of classroom materials."

"I would like to suggest some revision on the Library Service in that it applies mainly to a centralized library. We feel that more provision could be made for evaluation of libraries which exist in a self-contained classroom."

Checklists.

"The instructions for rating checklists and evaluation need some revision. We found that some teachers were too critical and others too lenient, but that probably can't be helped by you. The marking 'N' causes confusion. If the item is missing it is often passed off as not needed."

It would be better if some method of evaluating the degree of integration and coordination can be found."

"A suggestion we would like to offer would be a summation sheet to be used with the statistical summary for each section. This summary sheet would have spaces for comments listed under each division of the statistical summary. We found that definite patterns of strengths or weaknesses were evident under each division which teachers were unable to interpolate statistically. Each staff member could then have the results fastened in the manual for future reference."

Social Studies.

"Recommend greater emphasis on political boundaries--which influence people about as much as physical environment--and the acquisition of more definite facts: names of countries, their capitols, principal cities, specific industries in specific places. I think there tends to be too much generalizing and skimming in social studies, with pure geography suffering severe neglect."

Health and Physical Education.

One respondent feels that health and physical education need revision. "Due to our course of study and the emphasis on outside activities."

Library Services.

"We do not find central library as functional as the rotation use of classroom materials."

"I would like to suggest some revision on the Library Service in that it applies mainly to a centralized library. We feel that more provision could be made for evaluation of libraries which exist in self-contained classrooms."

Checklists.

"The instructions for rating checklists and evaluation need some revision. We found that some teachers were too critical and others too lenient, but that probably can't be helped by you. The marking 'W' causes confusion. If the item is missing it is often passed off as not needed."

"It would be better if some method of evaluating the degree of integration and coordination can be found."

"A suggestion we would like to offer would be a summation sheet to be used with the statistical summary for each section. This summary sheet would have spaces for comments listed under each division of the statistical summary. We found that definite patterns of strengths or weaknesses were evident under each division which teachers were unable to interpret statistically. Each staff member could then have the results fastened in the manual for future reference."

Social Studies.

"Recommend greater emphasis on political boundaries--which in-
fluence people about as much as physical environment--and the acquisition of more definite facts: names of countries, their capitals, principal cities, specific industries in specific places. I think there tends to be too much generalizing and skimming in social studies, with pure geography suffering severe neglect."

Health and Physical Education.

"One respondent feels that health and physical education need revision. Due to our course of study and the emphasis on outside activities."

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purposes of this investigation were:

1. To determine the purposes for which the "Elementary Evaluative Criteria" was being used.
2. To determine how the criteria has aided its users, in what ways and to what extent.
3. To determine the effectiveness of the criteria as an evaluating instrument in its entirety and in its separate sections.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A questionnaire was prepared and sent to 493 purchasers of the criteria. Of these 493 purchasers 168 of them bought five or more copies, 136 purchasers of one to four copies replied, and seventy-nine purchasers of five or more copies replied. The data obtained from the responses to this questionnaire were analyzed in four ways:

1. On the basis of all replies.
2. On the basis of those persons purchasing five or more copies of the criteria.
3. General comments from persons purchasing one to four copies of the criteria.
4. General comments from the persons purchasing five or more copies of the criteria.

As a result of the analysis of the data mentioned above, the following conclusions were reached:

The first of the two main results of this chapter is the following theorem.

Let M be a matrix in $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ and let λ be an eigenvalue of M . Then the algebraic multiplicity of λ is equal to the dimension of the generalized eigenspace of M corresponding to λ .

THEOREM 5.1

Let M be a matrix in $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ and let λ be an eigenvalue of M . Then the algebraic multiplicity of λ is equal to the dimension of the generalized eigenspace of M corresponding to λ .

Proof. Let λ be an eigenvalue of M . Then the algebraic multiplicity of λ is equal to the dimension of the generalized eigenspace of M corresponding to λ .

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter we have seen that the algebraic multiplicity of an eigenvalue is equal to the dimension of the generalized eigenspace corresponding to that eigenvalue. This result is fundamental in the study of linear transformations and matrices.

REFERENCES

[1] Hoffman, K.R., Kunen, K. Linear Algebra. Second Edition. Prentice Hall, 1970.

[2] Herstein, I.N. Topics in Algebra. Second Edition. Macmillan, 1975.

[3] Axler, P. Linear Algebra Done Right. Second Edition. Springer, 2013.

APPENDIX A

This appendix contains a collection of exercises and problems related to the material covered in this chapter. These are intended to reinforce the concepts and techniques discussed in the text.

Conclusions based on data pertaining to all replies.

1. The criteria were used for many purposes. The main purposes

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purposes of this investigation were:

1. To determine the purposes for which the "Elementary Evaluative Criteria" was being used. materials, and as resource materials.
2. To determine how the criteria has aided its users, in what ways and to what extent. received in regard to having any area of the
3. To determine the effectiveness of the criteria as an evaluating instrument in its entirety and in its separate sections.

A questionnaire was prepared and sent to 493 purchasers of the criteria. Of these 493 purchasers 168 of them bought five or more copies, 136 purchasers of one to four copies replied, and seventy-nine purchasers of five or more copies replied. The data obtained from the responses to this questionnaire were analyzed in four ways:

1. On the basis of all replies.
2. On the basis of those persons purchasing five or more copies of the criteria.
3. General comments from persons purchasing one to four copies of the criteria.
4. General comments from the persons purchasing five or more copies of the criteria. were used specifically to evaluate a total school

As a result of the analysis of the data mentioned above, the following conclusions were reached:

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purposes of this investigation were:

1. To determine the purposes for which the "Elementary Evaluative Criteria" was being used.
 2. To determine how the criteria has aided its users, in what ways and to what extent.
 3. To determine the effectiveness of the criteria as an evaluating instrument in its entirety and in its separate sections.
- A questionnaire was prepared and sent to 193 purchasers of the criteria. Of these 193 purchasers 108 of them bought five or more copies, 130 purchasers of one to four copies replied, and seventy-nine purchasers of five or more copies replied. The data obtained from the responses to this questionnaire were analyzed in four ways:
1. On the basis of all replies.
 2. On the basis of those persons purchasing five or more copies of the criteria.
 3. General comments from persons purchasing one to four copies of the criteria.
 4. General comments from the persons purchasing five or more copies of the criteria.
- As a result of the analysis of the data mentioned above, the following conclusions were reached:

Conclusions based on data pertaining to all replies.

1. The criteria were used for many purposes. The main purposes were:

- a. Evaluation of a single school.
- b. As a basis for discussion at teacher's meetings.
- c. For use in study groups.
- d. As reference materials, and as resource materials.

2. All sections of the criteria were considered satisfactory.

Negligible responses were received in regard to having any area of the criteria revised.

3. The instructions for rating checklists and evaluations were overwhelmingly considered adequate.

4. The statistics indicated that the subject areas need further integration and coordination. The number of replies that indicate this is not statistically sufficient to warrant this as being conclusive. (For comparative purposes see conclusion number four in the section below.)

5. The criteria were not being used with laymen to a very great extent.

6. The criteria afforded some degree of improvement to the majority of its users.

Conclusions based on data pertaining to replies of purchasers of five or more copies.

1. The criteria were used specifically to evaluate a total school system. In addition to this main purpose some of the respondents also

Conclusions based on data pertaining to all replies.

1. The criteria were used for many purposes. The main purposes

were:

- a. Evaluation of a single school.
 - b. as a basis for discussion at teacher's meetings.
 - c. for use in study groups.
 - d. as reference materials, and as resource materials.
2. All reactions of the criteria were considered satisfactory. Negligible responses were received in regard to having any area of the criteria revised.

3. The instructions for rating checklists and evaluations were overwhelmingly considered adequate.

4. The statistics indicated that the subject areas need further investigation and reevaluation. The number of replies that indicate this is not statistically sufficient to warrant this as being conclusive. (For comparative purposes see conclusion number four in the section below.)

5. The criteria were not being used with interest to a very great extent.

6. The criteria afforded some degree of improvement to the majority of the users.

Conclusions based on data pertaining to replies of purchasers of five or more copies.

1. The criteria were used specifically to evaluate a total school system. In addition to this main purpose some of the respondents also

used the criteria for reference materials and other miscellaneous uses.

2. All sections of The Elementary Evaluative Criteria were considered satisfactory. There was no indication of a need for revision or deletion of any part of the criteria as it now exists.

3. The instructions for rating checklists and evaluations were considered adequate.

4. The majority of the respondents felt that:

- a. The subject areas do not need further integration and coordination.
- b. The subject areas are suitable as set forth in The Elementary Evaluative Criteria for the majority of its users.

It is believed that this conclusion is more valid than number four, in the section above, due to the fact that the replies from the respondents who purchased five or more copies of the criteria were giving the aggregate opinion of a total school system, rather than the opinion of a single school.

5. The Elementary Evaluative Criteria is not being used with participating laymen to the extent that it is felt that it should be used.

6. The Elementary Evaluative Criteria has aided its users in many ways:

- a. It has served as a stimulant to the creative imagination of its users.
- b. It has provided worthy objectives for schools that differ in their philosophies of education.

7. The comments of the purchasers indicate that the criteria are the most practical of its kind.

used the criteria for reference materials and other miscellaneous uses.

2. All sections of the Elementary Evaluative Criteria were

considered satisfactory. There was no indication of a need for revision

or deletion of any part of the criteria as it now exists.

3. The instructions for rating checklists and evaluations were

considered adequate.

4. The majority of the respondents felt that:

a. The subject areas do not need further instruction and

conclusion.

b. The subject areas are suitable as set forth in the
Elementary Evaluative Criteria for the majority of the users.

It is believed that this conclusion is more valid than number

four, in the section above, due to the fact that the replies from the

respondents who purchased five or more copies of the criteria were

giving the aggregate opinion of a total school system, rather than the

opinion of a single school.

5. The Elementary Evaluative Criteria is not being used with

participating interest to the extent that it is felt that it should be used.

6. The Elementary Evaluative Criteria has aided the users in

many ways:

a. It has served as a stimulant to the creative imagination

of the users.

b. It has provided worthy objectives for schools that differ

in their philosophies of education.

7. The comments of the purchasers indicate that the criteria

are the most practical of the kind.

8. The criteria afforded some improvement to the majority of its users. The number of respondents who indicated that the criteria had afforded no improvement were infinitesimal.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

8. The criteria reflected some improvement to the majority of
its users. The number of respondents who indicated that the criteria
had afforded no improvement were infinitesimal.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Benjamin, E., "Combining Responses on Two Forms of a Questionnaire with Options in Inverse Order," Public Opinion Quarterly, No. 13, 1:666-690. 1949.

Davis, R. A. and E. L. Barrow, "Critical Study of the Questionnaire in Education," Education Administrator and Supervisor, 21:137-144. February, 1935.

Hammond, Sarah L. and Harold B. Drummond, "A Region Evaluates Its Elementary Schools," Educational Leadership, 8:75-104. November, 1950.

Henry, W. E., "Evaluating Elementary Schools," The Elementary School Journal, 46:307-308. February, 1946.

Huffman, Harry, "Improving the Questionnaire as a Tool of Research," The National Postsecondary Education Quarterly, 17:15-18. October, 1948.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Kee, Leonard V., The Questionnaire in Education, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928. 176 pp.

McNally, H. J., "Evaluation--Of What? For What?", Educational Administration and Supervision, 35:36-48. January, 1949.

Moore, Clarence C., "Increasing the Returns from Questionnaires," Journal of Educational Research, 35:138-141. October, 1941.

Nichols, Frederick G., "Criticism, Comment and Challenge," Journal of Business Education, 8:8. June, 1933.

Ostrander, R. E., "Evaluation in the Oak Ridge Schools," Educational Leadership, 8:86-90. November, 1950.

Parry, Hugh J. and Helen M. Crossley, "Validity of Responses to Survey Questions," Public Opinion Quarterly, No. 14, 1:61-80. 1950.

Payne, Stanley L., "Thoughts about Meaningless Questions," Public Opinion Quarterly, No. 14, 4:687-696. 1950.

Price, E. G., "On the Use of Stamped Return Envelopes with Mail Questionnaires," American Social Research, 15:672. October, 1950.

Sold, E., "Respondents and Non-respondents to Mail Questionnaires," Educational Research Bulletin, 21:87-96. April, 1942.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY
540 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. [Illegible]
2. [Illegible]
3. [Illegible]
4. [Illegible]
5. [Illegible]
6. [Illegible]
7. [Illegible]
8. [Illegible]
9. [Illegible]
10. [Illegible]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Benjamin, K., "Combining Responses on Two Forms of a Questionnaire with Options in Inverse Order," Public Opinion Quarterly, No. 13, 4:688-690. 1949.
- Davis, R. A. and E. L. Barrow, "Critical Study of the Questionnaire in Education," Education Administrator and Supervisor, 21:137-144. February, 1935.
- Hammond, Sarah L. and Harold D. Drummond, "A Region Evaluates Its Elementary Schools," Educational Leadership, 8:95-100. November, 1950.
- Henry, N. B., "Evaluating Elementary Schools," The Elementary School Journal, 46:307-308. February, 1946.
- Huffman, Harry, "Improving the Questionnaire as a Tool of Research," The National Business Education Quarterly, 17:15-18. October, 1948.
- Koos, Leonard V., The Questionnaire in Education, New York: The MacMillan Company, 1928. 178 pp.
- McNally, H. J., "Evaluation--Of What? For What?", Educational Administration and Supervision, 35:36-48. January, 1949.
- Moore, Clarence C., "Increasing the Returns from Questionnaires," Journal of Educational Research, 35:138-141. October, 1941.
- Nichols, Frederick G., "Criticism, Comment and Challenge," Journal of Business Education, 8:8. June, 1933.
- Ostrander, R. H., "Evaluation in the Oak Ridge Schools," Educational Leadership, 8:86-90. November, 1950.
- Parry, Hugh J. and Helen M. Crossley, "Validity of Responses to Survey Questions," Public Opinion Quarterly, No. 14, 1:61-80. 1950.
- Payne, Stanley L., "Thoughts about Meaningless Questions," Public Opinion Quarterly, No. 14, 4:687-696. 1950.
- Price, D. O., "On the use of Stamped Return Envelopes with Mail Questionnaires," American Social Research, 15:672. October, 1950.
- Reid, S., "Respondents and Non-respondents to Mail Questionnaires," Educational Research Bulletin, 21:87-96. April, 1942.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Benjamin, K., "Combining Responses on Two Parts of a Questionnaire with
Options in Inverse Order," Public Opinion Quarterly, No. 13,
p:633-650, 1949.
- Davis, R. A. and E. I. Barrow, "Critical Study of the Questionnaire in
Education," Education Administrator and Supervisor, 31:137-144,
February, 1935.
- Hawmond, Sarah L. and Harold D. Grumond, "A Region Evaluates Its Ele-
mentary Schools," Educational Leadership, 8:95-100, November,
1950.
- Henry, M. B., "Evaluating Elementary Schools," The Elementary School
Journal, 60:307-308, February, 1950.
- Hoffman, Harry, "Improving the Questionnaire as a Tool of Research,"
The National Business Education Quarterly, 17:15-18, October,
1948.
- Koss, Leonard V., The Questionnaire in Education, New York: The Macmillan
Company, 1938, 178 pp.
- McEliff, M. J., "Evaluation--Of What? For What?" Educational Adminis-
tration and Supervision, 35:36-48, January, 1949.
- Moore, Clarence C., "Interpreting the Returns from Questionnaires,"
Journal of Educational Research, 35:133-141, October, 1941.
- Nichols, Frederick G., "Criticalism, Comment and Challenge," Journal of
Business Education, 8:8, June, 1933.
- Ostromer, R. H., "Evaluation in the Oak Ridge Schools," Educational
Leadership, 8:86-90, November, 1950.
- Ferry, Hugh J. and Helen M. Crossley, "Validity of Responses to Survey
Questions," Public Opinion Quarterly, No. 14, 1:61-80, 1950.
- Payne, Stanley L., "Thoughts about Meaningless Questions," Public
Opinion Quarterly, No. 14, p:687-696, 1950.
- Price, D. O., "On the use of Stamped Return Envelopes with Mail Ques-
tionnaires," American Social Research, 15:675, October, 1950.
- Said, S., "Respondents and Non-respondents to Mail Questionnaires,"
Educational Research Bulletin, 31:87-96, April, 1945.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Remmers, H. H., "Evaluation in Curriculum Development," School and Society, 70:33-37. July, 1949.
- Research Division, National Education Association, "The Questionnaire," National Education Research Bulletin, Bulletin 8. 1930.
- Romine, S. A., "Criteria for a Better Questionnaire," Journal of Educational Research, 42:69-71. September, 1948.
- Shane, Harold G., "A 1950 Census of Evaluation Practices," Educational Leadership, 8:73-77. November, 1950.
- Taba, Hilda, "Current Evaluation Techniques," Childhood Education, 18:14-20. September, 1941.
- Troops, Herbert A., "Predicting the Returns from Questionnaires: A Study in the Utilization of Qualitative Data," Journal of Experimental Education, 3:204-215. March, 1935.
- Vincent, William S., "Taking Inventory--Finding Ways to Evaluate Results," School Executive, 69:73-78. January, 1950.
- Wrightstone, J. W., "Trends in Evaluation," Educational Leadership, 8:91-95. November, 1950.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Hammer, H. H., "Evaluation in Curriculum Development," School and Society, 70:33-37, July, 1948.
- Research Division, National Education Association, "The Questionnaire," National Education Research Bulletin, Bulletin 8, 1930.
- Hawkins, H. A., "Criteria for a Better Questionnaire," Journal of Educational Research, 42:69-71, September, 1948.
- Starr, Harold D., "A 1950 Census of Evaluation Practices," Educational Leadership, 8:73-77, November, 1950.
- Tabb, Eliza, "Current Evaluation Techniques," Childhood Education, 18:11-20, September, 1941.
- Trope, Herbert A., "Predicting the Returns from Questionnaires: A Study in the Utilization of Qualitative Data," Journal of Experimental Education, 3:204-215, March, 1935.
- Wassett, William S., "Taking Inventory--Finding Ways to Evaluate Results," School Executive, 69:73-78, January, 1950.
- Whitstone, J. W., "Trends in Evaluation," Educational Leadership, 8:91-95, November, 1950.

APPENDIX

A. QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO USES OF CRITERIA

I. Do you use the <u>Criteria</u> in any of the following ways?	PLAN TO USE		
	YES	NO	LATER
A. To evaluate elementary education in a total school system.	()	()	()
B. To evaluate a single elementary school	()	()	()
C. To evaluate a phase of elementary education (e.g. arithmetic, language arts, guidance services). . . .	()	()	()
D. For discussion in teachers' meetings	()	()	()

APPENDIX

E. For use in study groups,	()	()
F. For use in study groups,	()	()
G. For use in study groups,	()	()
H. For use in study groups,	()	()
I. For use in study groups,	()	()
J. For use in study groups,	()	()
K. For use in study groups,	()	()
L. For use in study groups,	()	()
M. For use in study groups,	()	()
N. For use in study groups,	()	()
O. For use in study groups,	()	()
P. For use in study groups,	()	()
Q. For use in study groups,	()	()
R. For use in study groups,	()	()
S. For use in study groups,	()	()
T. For use in study groups,	()	()
U. For use in study groups,	()	()
V. For use in study groups,	()	()
W. For use in study groups,	()	()
X. For use in study groups,	()	()
Y. For use in study groups,	()	()
Z. For use in study groups,	()	()

A. QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO USES OF CRITERIA

B. QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO CONTENTS OF CRITERIA

C. QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO GENERAL REACTIONS TO CRITERIA

D. LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

E. QUESTIONNAIRE FORM

APPENDIX

- A. QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO USES OF CRITERIA
- B. QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO CONTENTS OF CRITERIA
- C. QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO GENERAL REACTIONS TO CRITERIA
- D. LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL
- E. QUESTIONNAIRE FORM

APPENDIX

A. QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO USES OF CRITERIA

I. Do you use the <u>Criteria</u> in any of the following ways?	YES	NO	PLAN TO USE LATER
A. To evaluate elementary education in a total school system.	()	()	()
B. To evaluate a single elementary school	()	()	()
C. To evaluate a phase of elementary education (e.g. arithmetic, language arts, guidance services). ()	()	()	()
D. For discussion in teachers' meetings	()	()	()
E. For use in study groups, as resource, or reference material	()	()	()
F. Other_____	()	()	()

APPENDIX

A. QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO USES OF CRITERIA

I. Do you use the Criteria in any of the following ways?

	YES	NO	PLAN TO USE LATER
A. To evaluate elementary education in a total school system.	()	()	()
B. To evaluate a single elementary school.	()	()	()
C. To evaluate a phase of elementary education (e.g. artistic, language arts, guidance services).	()	()	()
D. For discussion in teachers' meetings.	()	()	()
E. For use in study groups, as resource, or reference material.	()	()	()
F. Other _____	()	()	()

APPENDIX

B. QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO CONTENTS OF CRITERIA

- II. Listed below are the titles of the various sections of the Criteria. Check in the parentheses provided your reaction to each of these sections.

	SATISFACTORY	NEEDS REVISION*	DELETE
Manual.	() - - -	() - - -	()
Philosophy and Objectives	() - - -	() - - -	()
The Curriculum.	() - - -	() - - -	()
Kindergarten	() - - -	() - - -	()
Arithmetic	() - - -	() - - -	()
Arts and Crafts.	() - - -	() - - -	()
Health and Physical Education.	() - - -	() - - -	()
Language Arts.	() - - -	() - - -	()
Music.	() - - -	() - - -	()
Science.	() - - -	() - - -	()
Social Studies	() - - -	() - - -	()
Library Services.	() - - -	() - - -	()
Guidance Services	() - - -	() - - -	()
School Plant.	() - - -	() - - -	()
School Staff and Administration	() - - -	() - - -	()
Individual Staff Member Data Sheet.	() - - -	() - - -	()

* Suggestions for revision or further information should be written on the reverse side.

NEEDS	REVISION*	DELETED	SATISFACTORY	DELETED
Individual Staff Member Data Sheet	-	-	-	()
School Staff and Administration	-	-	-	()
School Plant	-	-	-	()
Guidance Services	-	-	-	()
Library Services	-	-	-	()
Social Studies	-	-	-	()
Science	-	-	-	()
Math	-	-	-	()
Language Arts	-	-	-	()
Health and Physical Education	-	-	-	()
Arts and Crafts	-	-	-	()
Artistic	-	-	-	()
Kindergarten	-	-	-	()
The Curriculum	-	-	-	()
Philosophy and Objectives	-	-	-	()
Manual	-	-	-	()

APPENDIX

C. QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO GENERAL REACTIONS TO CRITERIA

III. General Reactions

- | | YES | NO |
|---|-----------------------|--------------|
| A. Do you consider the instructions for rating checklist and evaluation items adequate? | () | ()* |
| B. Should increased attention be given to the integration and coordination of subject areas? | ()* | () |
| C. In your position of () administrator, () supervisor, or () teacher, have the <u>Criteria</u> been of assistance to you? | () | () |
| D. Have the <u>Criteria</u> been used with lay personnel? | () | () |
| | Degree of Improvement | |
| | Extensive | Some None |
| E. Has use of the Criteria brought about improvements in your school system? | () | () () |

Respondent

Investigator

Name _____ Position _____
 Address _____
Research Assistant

* Suggestions for revision or further information should be written on the reverse side.

APPENDIX

C. QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO GENERAL REACTIONS TO CRITERIA

III. General Reactions

YES NO

A. Do you consider the instructions for rating checked
and evaluation items adequate? () () *

B. Should increased attention be given to the instruction
and coordination of subject areas? () () *

C. In your position of () administrator, () supervisor,
or () teacher, have the Criteria been of assistance
to you? () ()

D. Have the Criteria been used with lay personnel? () ()

E. Has use of the Criteria brought about
improvements in your school system? () ()

Investigator

Respondent

Name _____ Position _____

Address _____

* Suggestions for revision or further information should be written on
the reverse side.

APPENDIX

D. LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

ELEMENTARY EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

332 Bay State Road
Boston, Massachusetts

Our files indicate that you have purchased during the past year copies of Elementary Evaluative Criteria.

We are interested in finding out how these materials have been used, how effective they have been, and any suggestions you may have for revision and improvement.

On the attached sheet is a series of questions to which we would like your candid reaction. Your reactions and critical evaluation of this publication are of interest to us who have developed it and will be of definite value to those who may be using it in the future.

A self-addressed envelope has been provided to facilitate your return of the questionnaire to us. We would appreciate an immediate reply.

Thank you for your kind cooperation in this research effort.

Sincerely yours,

Research Assistant

APPENDIX

E. QUESTIONNAIRE FORM

ELEMENTARY EVALUATIVE CRITERIA INQUIRY

- I. Do you use the Criteria in any of the following ways? PLAN
TO USE
LATER
- | | YES | NO | LATER |
|---|-----|-----|-------|
| A. To evaluate elementary education in a total school system. | () | () | () |
| B. To evaluate a single elementary school | () | () | () |
| C. To evaluate a phase of elementary education (e.g. arithmetic, language arts, guidance services). | () | () | () |
| D. For discussion in teachers' meetings | () | () | () |
| E. For use in study groups, as resource, or reference material | () | () | () |
| F. Other _____ | () | () | () |

- II. Listed below are the titles of the various sections of the Criteria. Check in the parentheses provided your reaction to each of these sections.

	SATISFACTORY	NEEDS REVISION*	DELETE
Manual.	() - - - -	() - - - -	()
Philosophy and Objectives	() - - - -	() - - - -	()
The Curriculum.	() - - - -	() - - - -	()
Kindergarten	() - - - -	() - - - -	()
Arithmetic	() - - - -	() - - - -	()
Arts and Crafts.	() - - - -	() - - - -	()
Health and Physical Education.	() - - - -	() - - - -	()
Language Arts.	() - - - -	() - - - -	()
Music.	() - - - -	() - - - -	()
Science.	() - - - -	() - - - -	()
Social Studies	() - - - -	() - - - -	()
Library Services.	() - - - -	() - - - -	()
Guidance Services	() - - - -	() - - - -	()
School Plant.	() - - - -	() - - - -	()
School Staff and Administration	() - - - -	() - - - -	()
Individual Staff Member Data Sheet.	() - - - -	() - - - -	()

() () () school system

U. For discussion in teachers' meetings: meeting () () ()

					Individual Staff Member Data Sheet
					School Staff and Administration
					School Plant
					Ordinance Services
					Library Services
					Social Studies
					Science
					Music
					Language Arts
					Health and Physical Education
					Arts and Crafts
					Artistic
					Kindsergarten
					The Curriculum
					Philosophy and Objectives
					Manual

III. General Reactions

- | | YES | NO |
|---|---------------------------|---------|
| A. Do you consider the instructions for rating checklist and evaluation items adequate? | () | ()* |
| B. Should increased attention be given to the integration and coordination of subject areas? | ()* | () |
| C. In your position of () administrator, () supervisor, or () teacher, have the <u>Criteria</u> been of assistance to you? | () | () |
| D. Have the <u>Criteria</u> been used with lay personnel? | () | () |
| | Degree of Improvement | |
| | Extensive Some None | |
| E. Has use of the Criteria brought about improvements in your school system? | () | () () |

Respondent

Investigator

Name _____ Position _____
 Address _____
 Research Assistant

* Suggestions for revision or further information should be written on the reverse side.

III. General Questions

- A. Do you consider the instructions for rating checklist
 and evaluation items adequate? () () *
 B. Should increased attention be given to the instruction
 and coordination of subject areas? () () *
 C. In your position as () administrator, () supervisor,
 or () teacher, have the Criteria been of assistance
 to you? () ()
 D. Have the Criteria been used with lay personnel? () ()
 Degree of Improvement
 Extensive Some None
 E. Has use of the Criteria brought about
 improvements in your school system? () () () ()

Investigator

Respondent

Position

Name

Research Assistant

Address

* Suggestions for revision or further information should be written on
 the reverse side.

EFFICIENCY BRAND

PAO CONTENT

1 1719 02559 6307

Thesis
Degnan, JP
1955

DATE _____

ISSUED TO

205 520

WILD WILLIAM C

9205 468

Oscar 2

Thesis
Degnan, *J.P.* et al
1955

Good

FEB. 26 1966

Degnan. *John D.*
An evaluation of the elementary
evaluative criteria.

